

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Diplomová práce

Bc. Lucie Čížková

Přístupy a postoje učitelů k výuce gramatiky angličtiny

Teachers' Attitudes and Beliefs Regarding English Grammar Teaching

Praha 2015

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Tomáš Gráf

Poděkování

Chtěla bych poděkovat vedoucímu práce PhDr. Tomáši Gráfovi za cenné podněty a podporu.

Mé poděkování patří i učitelům, kteří se zúčastnili dotazníkového šetření pro účely této práce.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 15. ledna 2015

.....

Lucie Čížková

Klíčová slova (česky)

ELT, výuka gramatiky, metody výuky gramatiky, L1, *teacher cognition*, TLA, post-metodické období, *focus on form*

Abstrakt (česky)

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá přístupy a postoji učitelů k výuce gramatiky v hodinách anglického jazyka na českých středních školách. Vychází z předpokladu, že rozhodnutí a konání učitelů v rámci výuky cizího jazyka jsou výsledkem toho, co učitelé znají, co si myslí a v co věří. Výzkumná část, která je založena na dotazníkovém šetření mezi učiteli, pozoruje a popisuje názory učitelů na výuku a učení anglické gramatiky a snaží se porovnat vyjádřené názory s postupy ve výuce gramatiky v hodinách anglického jazyka, tak jak je učitelé popsali nebo nepřímo vyjádřili. Výzkum se zaměřil na několik hlavních oblastí: přístupy ve výuce anglické gramatiky, procvičování gramatiky, opravování gramatických chyb, užití mateřského jazyka ve výuce gramatiky a používání učebnic při výuce gramatiky. Kromě toho práce pozoruje pojetí metody očima učitelů vzhledem k současnému post-metodickému trendu, který nově vymezuje vztah metody a učitele jako tvořivého a kritického jedince.

Key words (in English)

ELT, teaching grammar, grammar-teaching methods, L1, teacher cognition, TLA, post-method era, focus on form

Abstract (in English)

This diploma thesis focuses on teachers' attitudes and beliefs regarding English grammar teaching at Czech high schools. The thesis is based on the assumption that teachers' decisions and actions in ESL and EFL teaching are motivated by what teachers know, think and believe. It takes the concept of teacher cognition as a starting point. The research part of the thesis is based on a questionnaire survey among Czech high-school teachers. It aims to observe teachers' beliefs about English grammar teaching and learning and to describe the way English grammar is taught at Czech high schools. The main areas which the research focuses on are grammar teaching approaches, grammar practice, grammatical error correction, the use of L1 in teaching grammar and the use of coursebooks. Moreover, the thesis observes teachers' position towards the concept of method with respect to the recent trend discussed in ELT research – the post-method condition which redefines the relationship of 'method' and a teacher who is understood as a critical and creative strategic thinker.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations.....	7
List of Tables.....	8
1 Introduction.....	9
2 Theoretical Background: Approaches to Teaching Grammar – Key Aspects.....	11
2.1 A Brief Look Into History.....	11
2.2 Tradition of Latin Grammar.....	11
2.3 The First Reform Attempts.....	12
2.4 A Concise Survey of Approaches and Methods of Grammar Teaching.....	13
2.4.1 Grammar-Translation Method (GTM).....	13
2.4.2 GTM Criticism and Modification.....	15
2.4.3 The Reform Movement.....	15
2.4.4 Direct Method (DM).....	16
2.4.5 DM Criticism and Modification.....	17
2.4.6 Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching.....	18
2.4.8 ALM Criticism.....	20
2.4.9 Explicit Grammar Instruction.....	21
2.4.10 Cognitive-code Approach.....	22
2.4.11 PPP.....	22
2.4.12 PPP Criticism and Alternatives.....	23
2.4.13 Consciousness-Raising, Noticing, Tracing.....	24
2.4.14 Hypothesis Testing and Scaffolding.....	25
2.4.15 Post-method Condition.....	25
3 Theoretical Background: Teacher Cognition.....	27
3.1 Language as a Form or Language as a Function.....	27
3.2 The Origins of Language Teacher Cognition Research.....	27
3.3 The Role of Grammar Teaching in L2 Education.....	28
3.4 Teacher Language Awareness (TLA).....	29
3.5 Understanding External Variables Behind Teachers' Practice.....	31
3.6 Grammar Teaching Models.....	33
3.7 Grammar Teaching Strategies.....	34
3.8 Models of Learning Grammar.....	36
3.9 Grammar Practice.....	36
3.10 Grammatical Errors.....	37
3.11 Post-error Feedback.....	38
3.12 Use of Students' L1.....	40
3.13 Coursebooks and Other Teaching Materials.....	40
3.14 Use of Metalinguistic Terminology.....	41
3.15 “Teach Students, Not Grammar”.....	42
3.16 Teachers' Roles.....	42
4 Methodology.....	44
4.1 Participants.....	44
4.2 The Research Instrument.....	44
4.3 Pilot Questionnaire.....	45
4.4 Final Form of the Questionnaire.....	46
5 Data Analysis.....	48
5.1 Typical Respondent.....	48
5.2 Analysis of Questionnaire Items.....	48
5.2.1 The Way Students Learn Grammar.....	48
5.2.2 Importance of Grammar in Learning English.....	51
5.2.3 Grammar Teaching Approaches.....	53

5.2.4 Grammar Practice.....	55
5.2.5 Grammatical Errors.....	58
5.3 Teaching Strategies in Grammar Teaching.....	61
5.3.1 The Use of L1.....	61
5.3.2 Grammar Teaching Approaches.....	62
5.3.3 Grammar Practice.....	64
5.3.4 Grammatical Errors.....	65
5.4 Analysis of the Open Questionnaire Item (68).....	69
5.4.1 Teacher 1.....	69
5.4.2 Teacher 2.....	70
5.4.3 Teacher 3.....	72
5.4.4 Teacher 4.....	74
5.4.5 Teacher 5.....	75
5.4.6 Teacher 6.....	76
5.4.7 Teacher 7.....	78
5.4.8 Teacher 8.....	78
5.4.9 Eclecticism and Combination of Methods.....	79
5.4.10 Students' Needs.....	80
5.4.11 PPP.....	81
5.4.12 Other Descriptions.....	82
5.4.13 Summary.....	84
6 Discussion of Findings.....	86
7 Conclusion.....	91
Résumé.....	95
References.....	101
Appendix I: Pilot Questionnaire.....	103
Appendix II: Final Form of the Questionnaire.....	109

List of Abbreviations

ALM	Audiolingual Method
CRA	Clarification and focus, Restricted use and Authentic use
CSI	Czech School Inspectorate
DM	Direct Method
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
ESA	Engage, Study, Activate
ESL	English as a Second Language
GTM	Grammar-Translation Method
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
OHE	Observe, Hypothesise, Experiment
PPP	Presentation Practice Production
SLT	Situational-Language Teaching
TEFL	Teaching English as a Foreign Language
TLA	Teacher Language Awareness
ZPD	the zone of proximal development

List of Tables

Table 1: The Way Students Learn Grammar	50
Table 2: Importance of Grammar in Learning English	53
Table 3: Grammar Teaching Approaches	55
Table 4: How Do You Teach Grammar in Your English Classes?	55
Table 5: Grammar Practice	58
Table 6: Grammatical Errors	61
Table 7: Frequency of Use of Grammar-Teaching Strategies	67
Table 8: Effectivity of Grammar-Teaching Strategies	68
Table 9: Eclecticism and Combination of Methods	80
Table 10: Students' Needs	81
Table 11: PPP	82
Table 12: Other Descriptions	83

1 Introduction

The field of ELT registered adoption and rejection of multiple grammar teaching approaches and methods since the beginning of the twentieth century. The changes were motivated by the need to satisfy the learners' needs in different periods and the solution was always seen in a new method that would be generalisable and applicable in different learning contexts. There was the belief that employment of a particular method by teachers in EFL and ESL classrooms would automatically lead to successful learning. When teaching resulted in a failure, the inability to use a particular method which guaranteed success of teaching was blamed. (Richards and Rogers, 2001: 14-15)

In the second half of the century, it was a teacher as the one who is responsible for teaching that became the focus of closer examination. In the 1960s, the behaviouristic research viewed student learning as effected by teacher behaviour. In the 1970s, findings of research in cognitive psychology suggested the role of teachers' beliefs in how they teach. Besides their beliefs, teachers' perceptions, reflections and evaluations were considered phenomena which form teachers' decisions that project into teaching and learning processes. Teacher cognition thus became a new subject of interest in language teaching and a domain of many investigations that attempted to understand and describe mental processes teachers' behaviour is based on. (Borg, 2006: 6-10) In terms of curricular areas, grammar has been one of the major topics of studies which explore teacher cognition (Borg, 2003: 83)

This thesis works with the concept of teacher cognition as “the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching – what teachers know, believe and think” (Borg, 2003: 81). This allows us to view grammar instruction from the perspective of English teachers whose cognition shapes teachers' actions in the classroom and, at the same time, is shaped by teachers' experience. There are various factors that influence teachers: external variables such as student preferences and educational institution expectations, and inner variables such as prior experience as L2 learners. (Borg, 2003: 99-100) The thesis study was conducted with the aim to observe teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning of English grammar and their relation with the teachers' reported classroom practices. The main focus was on the following areas: grammar teaching approach, grammar practice, grammatical error correction, the use of L1 in teaching grammar and the use of coursebooks. Moreover, the thesis observes teachers' position towards the concept of method with respect to the recent trend discussed by ELT

researchers¹ – the post-method condition which redefines the relationship of the construct of method and a teacher understood as a method practitioner in a way that puts the teacher into the role of a critical and creative strategic thinker (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 27).

The theoretical part of the thesis is divided into two parts. The first part provides an account of selected major grammar-teaching approaches and methods with respect to the historical changes in the area of ELT. The second part deals with teacher cognition, it discusses variables that form teachers' theories and influence their grammar practices, and it outlines major grammar teaching and learning models. The empirical part of the thesis is concerned with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data received from 93 Czech high-school teachers in a questionnaire survey. The purpose of the thesis is not to evaluate Czech teachers and the way they teach English grammar as either right or wrong since, as it will be noticed, to apply such a black-and-white dichotomy to the field of grammar teaching would be highly inappropriate. The thesis rather aims to discuss and understand motives underlying the teachers' beliefs, decisions and actions in the context of EFL classroom.

¹ Kumaravadivelu (1994), Kumaravadivelu (2003), Thornbury (2011), Richards and Rogers (2001)

2 Theoretical Background: Approaches to Teaching Grammar – Key Aspects

2.1 A Brief Look Into History

Nassaji and Fotos (2011: 1) say that “grammar is fundamental to language”. It is not thus surprising that since long grammar has been fundamental also to language teaching; even to the extent that “language teaching was equated with grammar teaching” (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 2). Grammar as a system of word-formation rules was studied already by Babylonian scribes in the second millennium B.C. who were using grammar tablets to learn to write Akkadian and Sumerian and to translate between the two languages. Study of grammar was thus connected first with teaching and learning of the skill of writing which is evident also from the etymology of the word “grammar” itself: it comes from the Greek word *grammata* (“letters” in English) and was first used in the term *grammatiké* that means “understanding letters”. (Hudson, 2009: 126)

Grammar was the major item in language teaching curricula throughout the Middle Ages: it was used as an organizing principle of the whole process of teaching, the content of teaching and the basis for developing language teaching materials (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 2). The importance of grammar knowledge originated from classical education in ancient Greece where the skills of grammar, rhetoric and logic known as *trivium*, the core skills of *septem artes liberales* (seven liberal arts that consisted of *trivium* and *quadrivium* including arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy), were considered essential studies for a free person who wanted to participate actively in civic life.

2.2 Tradition of Latin Grammar

Nowadays, knowledge of at least one foreign language such as English is considered a norm in high school education. By the end of the Middle Ages, however, “Latin was the dominant language of education, commerce, religion and government in the Western world” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 3). English was spoken widely in England but knowledge of Latin was respected as a “mark of a properly educated man or woman” (Howatt, 2004: 10). Therefore, Latin grammar that was based on eight Greek grammatical categories (nouns, verbs, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs, particles, articles and conjunctions) was taught in schools (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 2). Latin was in fact the only language regarded as “having” grammar until a description of the French grammar system appeared in 1530, not speaking about grammar of the English language that was published by William Bullokar only at the

beginning of the following century (Howatt, 2004: 11).

By that time, vernacular languages including English were becoming more important both for the spoken and written communication and Latin was becoming a dead language. Nevertheless, it kept the status of a classical ideal language with grammar that had been worshipped for centuries. The new function of Latin consisted in becoming a model for teaching foreign languages. Students in English grammar schools were subjected to memorizing Latin grammar rules such as conjugation and declension patterns. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 2) during lessons that relied mainly on text as a teaching material (Howatt, 2004: 11). In addition, teachers liked to use the form of a dialogue which had been a favourite technique of teaching spoken Latin in the centuries before. The dialogue, or colloquy, was based on a written text divided into a set of questions and answers that served as an aid for rote learning of theoretical knowledge that should have been preserved in students' minds. (Howatt, 2004: 11) This way of learning by heart certainly trained students' memories and satisfied thus the idea of “mental exercise” that should have prepared learners for further education – study of rhetoric and grammar like in classical Greece.

2.3 The First Reform Attempts

There were attempts to overcome this stultifying practice by several alternative approaches. In the seventeenth century, Jan Amos Comenius believed that the mother tongue and foreign languages (if necessary for practical purposes, e.g. communication with neighbouring countries) should have been the central part of education. The classical languages were meant to be studied solely for academic or professional purposes for no more than a year and a half. (Howatt, 2004: 48) Joseph Webbe, one of the first 'anti-grammar' tradition promoters, introduced a very modern idea saying that the “start-point for learning a language (Latin in Webbe's times) was an exercise of communication skills which would lead to a knowledge of the grammar through use” (Howatt, 2004: 40). These efforts, however powerful and revolutionary they may sound, did not manage to challenge the classical curriculum that stayed dominant throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with minor changes in the eighteenth century when private schools and academies started to be established (Howatt, 2004: 37).

In the nineteenth century, the main purpose of teaching a foreign language was not to prepare learners for communication in English like nowadays; the goal of language teaching was rather to develop the ability to read foreign literature and to grow intellectually through

the mental exercise of learning (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 5). It was even believed that the study of foreign languages could improve understanding of the native language grammar and thus help students speak and write their mother tongue better (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 11). The tradition of language pedagogy was still strongly influenced by the model of teaching Latin and Greek which consisted in learning to read texts based on individual study of grammar and use of dictionaries. However, such a procedure was not suitable for younger pupils and it was necessary to adjust the time-tested way of teaching languages to school classroom education. (Howatt, 2004: 130-131)

2.4 A Concise Survey of Approaches and Methods of Grammar Teaching

2.4.1 Grammar-Translation Method (GTM)

The grammar-translation method (GTM), as its name implies, preserved the focus on grammar and translation (Howatt, 2004: 151). One of the aims – mastering the structure of language – consisted in “detailed analysis of grammar rules followed by the application of this knowledge to the task of translating into and out of the target language” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 5). One of the most important and also most criticized features was the replacement of a text with a sentence as the basic unit of teaching based on the belief that the explanation of grammar through exemplificatory sentences was easier and clearer than by texts extracted from classical authors' pieces of writing. Sentences were also considered more useful for practice exercises which constituted the principal part of lessons. (Howatt, 2004: 152)

A lot of practice was still believed to be beneficial for students' intellectual development but, more importantly, it was aimed at a high level of accuracy desired partly because of written examinations introduced in England in the 1850s and later expanded world-wide. The Cambridge (and initially also Oxford) system of exams was tasked with setting some necessary standards which would help sort out and label achieved levels of language knowledge and also distinguish good schools from bad educational institutions. The language became measurable and indirectly thus set its teaching priorities – the aspects of language that were tested and measured – which constituted the programme of lessons that followed GTM. (Howatt, 2004: 153)

As Larsen-Freeman (2000: 13-14) demonstrates and as Nassaji and Fotos (2011: 2) describe, this method deals with language classified into eight parts of speech (nouns, verbs,

adverbs, pronouns, articles, participles, conjunctions and prepositions) and is viewed basically as a set of structural patterns and grammatical rules which are presented to students explicitly. Learners are consequently required to memorize the grammatical rules and paradigms and apply them to examples using deduction. The purpose of this process is not the development of students' ability to use the language for spoken communication but the development of the translation skill, reading literature in the target language and the ability to write in it.

GTM was criticized mainly due to the tiresome process of memorization of grammatical paradigms, however, as Richards and Rodgers (2001: 7) point out, different versions of GTM are still practised in some school environments in which “reading literary texts is the primary focus of foreign language study” where this method serves its purpose. In general school environments, both teachers and students like to use translation of target language texts to the mother tongue since comparison of the two languages can help students. However, excessive concentration on equivalents prevents students from receiving natural language input and hence acquiring the language. (Harmer, 2007: 49)

The traditional distribution of roles which gives teachers a position of authorities who have power over grammatical rules and paradigms that students do not know or perhaps do not know better, the content of the lessons that is under instructors' control and the tests that ask students mostly to translate from or to the target language and to use grammar rules in exercises that should demonstrate their knowledge of grammar present a comfortable option of teaching a language. Especially novice teachers and instructors who feel insecure about their speaking proficiency might like to employ GTM since it legitimises the use of native language and requires a high degree of accuracy. Since there is either a single correct answer or a limited range of correct solutions, the teachers do not have to be afraid of finding themselves in unexpected situations. A GTM lesson or an activity is directed by teachers for the whole time. Moreover, techniques connected with this method require little from the part of the educator and are relatively easy as for planning, preparation and coordination in the class. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 5-6) Despite the fact GTM is still used by many teachers, Richards and Rodgers (2001: 7) mention that “it is a method for which there is no theory – no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology or educational theory”.

2.4.2 GTM Criticism and Modification

The inadequacies of GTM were realized by schoolmasters and linguists already in the nineteenth century. With the age of industrialisation, more opportunities to travel and a rising emigration to the United States, more and more people needed to learn English. However, most of these people had not received any academic education and it was impossible for them to learn a foreign language in traditional ways since they wanted to use the language in communication and to learn it quickly and easily. (Howatt, 2004: 159) Two of the new methodologists Franz Ahn and H.G. Ollendorf used the idea of GTM and modified it into a “practical” method – they reversed the order in GTM and proposed practice before theory. Grammatical explanation, though an important part of the method, was limited to grammatical paradigms and failed to provide enough information about syntax which lead to the inability to distinguish between grammatical and acceptable, and grammatical but unacceptable sentences in the language. (Howatt, 2004: 164) Nevertheless, Ollendorf was the first to introduce a graded linguistic syllabus that ordered new grammatical points logically and was similar to the structural approach syllabus (Howatt, 2004: 162-3).

Ahn, Ollendorf and other scholars of the nineteenth century definitely contributed to a progress in teaching languages and introduced an altered position of grammar in it (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 9). Linguists started realizing that description of language in terms of parts of speech was inadequate and that languages should be understood rather as systems with inner structures (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 2). However, partly due to the time when teachers' organisations and journals only started being established and partly due to more revolutionary ideas that came only later, a larger step towards an advance in language education did not come until the Reform Movement (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 9).

2.4.3 The Reform Movement

The Reform Movement promoted speaking L2 in lessons and limited the use of L1 to occasional vocabulary translations and grammar explanations. As for grammar teaching, linguists who were part of the Movement proposed to teach new grammar points inductively (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 9). It is important to mention that “inductive” was not equal to the technique of discovery by a student as it is understood nowadays. Henry Sweet explained the idea of inductive approach to grammar rather as more teacher-focused since it was the instructor who selected certain grammar points in a coherent text, showed and explained them to the learners and helped them to establish the rules that way. (Howatt, 2004: 204)

According to Sweet, discovery teaching of grammar represented a big danger in a language classroom. Teachers should have realised that even though some students might have found this technique engaging thanks to their feeling of success because they figured out a rule, other students were likely to become inhibited and later resign to learning. This danger was to be prevented by teacher's assistance and also a good choice of a text and grammar points that could be found in it. Sweet admitted that if the text was supposed to be a piece of natural language, it could hardly be limited to one grammar point. (Howatt, 2004: 204-5) The solution was then simple: the best option was to focus on a limited number of grammatical phenomena. At the beginner's levels, ideally just one should have been presented as grammar and the rest of potential grammar points was to be treated as lexical items and introduced only later. (Howatt, 2004: 193)

2.4.4 Direct Method (DM)

Avoiding translation and limiting the use of learners' native language together with the other tenets of the Reform Movement might suggest a similarity with natural principles of language learning. Sweet, however, was against the natural approach particularly because it contradicted his beliefs about the role of a school learner who, if put to the position of a child acquiring a first language, is deprived of his abilities such as using grammar, the capacity to analyse language, make generalisations about it etc. (Howatt, 2004: 205)

Natural methods developed from the belief about a foreign language learning that is similar to acquisition of the first language (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 11). This view of learning a language was not new at the turn of the nineteenth century: in the seventeenth century, Joseph Webbe promoted his method of teaching languages that dismissed grammar as an element inhibiting learners' progress. Instead of studying grammar, students should have concentrated on reading, writing and speaking through which they were expected to learn grammar unconsciously. (Howatt, 2004: 40) The approach of Webbe and scholars before and after him, however, won recognition only with the changes in society connected with a new generation of language learners in the nineteenth century mentioned above.

The philosophy of the DM follows the idea of the Reform Movement that grammar has to be taught inductively (Howatt, 2004: 210). DM lessons are devoted mostly to speaking and are highly teacher-centered, nonetheless, unlike in GTM, learners become their instructor's partners in the learning process (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 28). Speaking in DM is not considered a filler between exercises or activities or a language of instruction but as a

learning activity itself. Students are engaged into a question-answer interaction directed by a teacher who takes care of including desired grammar points in conversation.

Grammar is not explained but naturally used by both teachers and learners who should ideally notice a grammatical feature, make a generalisation about it and thus learn it. Explicit presentation of grammar rules is optimally not given. (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 23-26) It is also quite obvious that by a teacher as a model replacing a coursebook and students recycling and repeating their model's speech, DM employs habit formation. A formed habit then becomes an unconsciously gained rule that students are able to demonstrate in grammar exercises that follow the inductive phase. (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 26)

2.4.5 DM Criticism and Modification

Although DM focuses on conversation and pretends to leave grammar almost as a by-product, it should be admitted that this method has grammar knowledge as one of its goals. One of the reasons why teachers tried to avoid translation, use of L1 and explicit grammar explanation may have been their conviction about the possibility to teach a foreign language like L1. Another explanation of an unclear theoretical foundations may have been the fact that it “missed a rigorous basis in applied linguistic theory [and, therefore, it was criticised as a] product of enlightened amateurism” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 12-13). One of the points of criticism was that DM taught language “in a mechanical and superficial manner” (Howatt, 2004: 225). Moreover, because of the excessive reliance on the teacher, students, for instance, “learnt how to answer questions very skilfully, but could not ask them” (Howatt, 2004: 221). In other words, the form of question was introduced but students did not learn it. Smarter learners may have discovered how the question was constructed and used but the rest was limited to the thing they were required to do – to react to it. This imperfection occurred quite logically if we assume that this method tried to imitate a long-standing process of acquisition of L1 during a maximum of several sessions in a week.

By the 1920s, there were attempts to overcome the inadequacies by “a combination of DM techniques with more controlled grammar-based activities” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 13). The imperfections raised discussions about the need to base language teaching on a 'method' that had to be “constructed by experts in the field [...and address teachers'] beliefs about the nature of language and learning [...and that would refer to] procedures teachers should follow in the classroom [...] to achieve their stated or unstated teaching objectives” (Thornbury, 2011: 185).

2.4.6 Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching

The basis of language teaching methodology was for the first time developed by the British applied linguists Harold Palmer and A.S. Hornby (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 36). Their Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching (SLT) were similar to DM regarding learning a language as a speech habit (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 41). An innovation this approach brought was the view of language as a structure underlying speaking which was to be practised in a situation giving a meaningful context (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 40).

Grammar was viewed as sentence patterns consisting of form-classes on morphemic, word and phrasal levels that entered into functional relationships and thus produced sentences (Howatt, 2004: 271). As Howatt (2004: 271) mentions, the stress on sentence structure twisted the theory of connected text proposed earlier by the Reform Movement. Nevertheless, this shift was not back to the concept of sentence as parts of speech promoted by GTM mentioned above. Sentences given to students as examples were regarded as complete units (Howatt, 2004: 271) and were laid out in substitution tables which were designed to help learners “discover the underlying rules without spending a lot of time 'talking about grammar’” (Mothejzík, 1988: 94).

Unlike DM, grammatical features were graded from the simple to the most complex ones and presented to learners accordingly (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 41). Hornby went deeper and proposed to grade learning material according to the complexity of language that learners had to be familiar with to understand the context which a particular grammar item was presented in (Howatt, 2004: 298). Explication of grammar and the use of L1 were not supported, Thornbury (2011: 188) even claims that “the use of situations to contextualize grammar items obviated the need for explanation or translation”. Students were expected to understand grammatical features through presentation and practice, generalize the rule and be able to use it in a correct situation outside the classroom (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 41). So that learners did not develop 'wrong habits', the teacher had a threefold role of a language model who set up situations and presented structures to be learnt, a conductor managing the pace of presentation and practice, and a manipulator making learners produce correct structures by questions, commands etc. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 43).

Howatt (2004: 300) asserts that teachers following SLT make a great use of textbooks. The lessons are then supported by grammatically organized lesson plans and various visual aids. The instructors, however, should use these rather as guides than as ideals that are to be strictly followed. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 44)

2.4.7 Audiolingual Method (ALM)

At the same time when SLT found a considerable support in Britain, American linguists Leonard Bloomfield, Charles Fries and others developed an approach to teaching English as a foreign language called Audiolingualism. The approach was based on “the Army Method” developed during WW II that had the basic aim of developing conversational proficiency as well as understanding basic grammatical features through an intensive oral drill. (Richards and Rogers, 50-51)

Audiolingual Method (ALM), unlike the Army Method that lacked a methodological basis in a similar way as DM, was based on structural linguistics (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 51) and focused primarily on teaching grammar (Mothejzíková, 1988: 96) which was viewed as “a branch of logic” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 54). The structural view of language suggested that its elements were organized linearly and, at the same time, had an internal hierarchical structure. ALM focused on acquiring the rules according to which the elements were combined, since to master them meant to master the language. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 55) It was not, however, understood as a language governed by a set of prescribed rules but as an authentic language that was used by native speakers (Howatt, 2004: 307).

Grammatical items are presented in grammatical patterns of which there is a finite number in a language. A pattern can be transformed into a question or an answer (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 43), however, it should be noted that patterns are not always identical with sentences (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 46) but are incorporated into them in speech (Nassaji and Fotos, 3). A characteristic feature of ALM is presentation of the patterns in spoken dialogues that provide a context, but not necessarily a situation like SLT (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 42). A dialogue is modelled by a teacher or a recording and imitated by students (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 45). In order to get control of more difficult patterns, a teacher can use “backward build-up drill” that makes students repeat a pattern by building it up from a smaller part and gradually expand it (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 36).

The pattern practice employs chain drills and single-slot or multiple-slot substitution drills (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 43) and is conducted through a lot of oral practice which should lead the learners to grasp and internalize grammar rules from examples demonstrated in diverse environments (Mothejzíková, 1988: 97). The purpose of such a learning process is not essentially to understand grammatical principles but primarily to develop the ability to give a grammatically accurate sentence structure (Mothejzíková, 1988: 97). In other words, students

develop a form of verbal behaviour through which they are able to react to a stimulus, provide a response and, most importantly, to repeat such a behaviour in the future (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 56).

ALM viewed every language as a unique system different from other languages on phonological, morphological and syntactical levels. According to Fries (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 52), the structural differences between learner's native language and a target language caused problems of learning some aspects of the foreign language. In order to prevent the interference, languages are subjected to contrastive analysis that can reveal potential dangers and help teachers adjust teaching materials and thus avoid learners' errors or misunderstandings before they might occur (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 52). Another way to allow students to acquire grammatically correct language is to use only the target language during the lessons (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 42). If, despite these preventive measures, students commit an error, it is corrected immediately so that they can form only good language habits (Larsen-Freeman, 2000: 43). Explicit explanation is usually given after learners become familiar enough with a grammatical structure and is focused mainly on distinctions from their native language (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 64).

2.4.8 ALM Criticism

By the 1960s, ALM started to be subjected to criticism. Firstly, the boring process of imitation and the use of isolated sentences instead of meaningful texts were seen as the reasons for students' inability to use the language spontaneously in real communication contexts. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 65) The view of L1 as a cause of students' errors that could be prevented was undermined by cognitive-code approach that suggested that some errors were developmental. They were understood as a part of learners' systematic hypothesis testing during which the students process the language consciously or subconsciously and sometimes overgeneralise or somehow misinterpret a rule as a natural part of the process of learning. It was therefore suggested that teachers should be more tolerant of errors and also reconsider the effect of habit formation practice and the importance of giving students explicit grammar rules so discouraged by ALM. (Thornbury, 2011: 187)

Despite a great portion of criticism, behaviourist drills are still practised nowadays. They are preferred especially by those who like the security of clearly stated linguistic contents of lessons directed by teachers themselves unlike the more recent methods that give both the teachers and students a relative freedom. (Harmer, 2001: 80) In general, drilling is

considered suitable for lower-level students who still have not acquired enough language for real-life communication. (Harmer, 2007: 49)

2.4.9 Explicit Grammar Instruction

In the 1970s and 1980s, explicit grammar instruction found its place in L2 methodology. It was partly a reply to communicative approaches that presented explicit grammar instruction and learner's errors correction as unnecessary for the development of communicative ability (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 4) that is practically an ability to use the language mainly in order to carry out a task and not to worry about grammatical inaccuracy if it does not stand in the way of successful completion of the task (Harmer, 2001: 85).

Communicative approaches were based on Krashen's hypothesis of exposure to comprehensible input that contained language "slightly above [the learner's] productive level" (Harmer, 2001: 71). It was said that only such a kind of input could ensure learners' subconscious acquisition of language that is used in a natural conversation. Krashen contrasted the implicit process of acquisition with learning that stood for language including grammar learnt consciously serving only as a monitor device that checks accuracy during spontaneous communication. (Harmer, 2001: 71) Krashen's theory was based on the belief that a foreign language can be acquired the way children acquire their native language (Harmer, 2001: 72).

It is possible that the natural model of learning a language works with children who tend to acquire languages implicitly more easily than adult learners. Nevertheless, teachers should not think that the best option is to avoid grammar instruction with younger learners completely. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 22) Most students have difficulties to understand new input if it is unmediated and hence it does not become intake (Ur, 1996: 11). Several hours a week spent in the classroom are only a fraction of the time L1 child learners are exposed to the language they acquire, therefore, teachers should always look for "ways to unlock the system" both with children and adult learners (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 22). This hypothesis was supported by the results of immersion programmes studies which showed that students, despite many hours of language exposure, did not acquire many aspects of grammar if they did not receive any instruction about them (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 8-9). Therefore, rather than imitate the natural process of language acquisition, teachers should stimulate the learners and accelerate the acquisition process (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 78).

Scheffler and Cinciala (2011: 22) suggested that thanks to explicit grammar rules,

students improve “understanding of [their] grammatical output and, in this way, contribute to a sense of security, confidence, and achievement [...] to the learning process in general”. Moreover, teaching some grammar points explicitly can save time both to teachers and learners, since especially adults prefer to be given explanation instead of a more lengthy process of figuring the rules out for themselves (Mothejzík, 1988: 96). Larsen-Freeman (2003: 96-97) suggests that explicit instruction is suitable for relatively straightforward rules, as a post-error explanation and for possibly difficult features due to learners' L1 but that complex rules should be accompanied by enough examples. In general, the trend nowadays proposes that form-focused instruction has a positive effect on the rate which the students obtain and maintain accuracy with (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 9).

2.4.10 Cognitive-code Approach

Cognitive-code approach was developed partly on the theory of transformational and generative grammar proposed by Noam Chomsky who rejected the behaviourist principles applied to learning a language (Richards and Rogers, 2001: 66). He suggested that humans are born with a kind of processor that allows us “to channel [the input] through the language-processing parts of our brain where [abstract] rules in some way reside, and where all input adds more information for the better functioning of that processor” (Harmer: 2001: 69). In other words, Chomsky proposed that the input allows learners to make use of their *competence*, i.e. what the learner knows about the language (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 3), and to formulate language rules (Harmer, 2001: 69). Such an activation gives the learners a potential to create, i.e. to generate sentence structures that they had not heard before. Accordingly, the students should be given various opportunities for creative use of language. (Harmer, 2001: 69)

2.4.11 PPP

Nowadays, a model of teaching grammar similar to both SLT and ALM that is used by many teachers and supported by many ESL/EFL coursebooks is PPP which follows a basic pattern of three phases of teaching grammar (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 4). The first P stands for *presentation* of grammar structures in a communicative context (e.g. a dialogue) that is supported by presentation of target grammar rules. The second P is usually a set of controlled (e.g. choral repetition, individual repetition, cue-response drills (Harmer: 2001: 80)) and free production exercises providing *practice*. (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 3) The last P: *production* is focused on spontaneous use of the learnt grammar in task-based exercises, reading etc.

(Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 3).

As the PPP model procedure provides sufficient practice of presented grammatical structures, it might seem that learners have the best conditions to master them perfectly. Mothejzíkova (1988: 96), however, asserts that “point-by-point presentation of structures makes it difficult for the students to acquire a systematic knowledge of areas of grammar which function as a unified whole in the language system.” This idea was confirmed by research on language acquisition processes that doubted the assumption that “what is taught is what is learned” (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 6). The reality of learners' internalizing new rules can be described rather as a “slow acquisition of form-function mappings and the regularities therein” (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 5). Consequently, teachers should not expect their students to develop the ability to use new grammar points freely in the order they are presented in the class (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 5).

2.4.12 PPP Criticism and Alternatives

A wave of criticism of PPP resulted in alternatives to this procedure, e.g. the “deep-end strategy” which starts with the production phase during which teachers check if students have any problems which can be consequently eliminated in presentation or practice phases (Harmer, 2001: 82). Another variation suggests that it is possible to start with any of the phases and continue with the one that follows in the original PPP (Harmer, 2001: 83).

In the 1990s, Jim Scrivener encouraged the teachers to adjust the PPP model to their and their students' needs. He renamed PPP as CRA: **C**larification and focus, **R**estricted use and **A**uthentic use and proposed that each of these phases can be combined in a different order and/or repeated depending on the type of lesson, e.g. CACACR. (Harmer, 2001: 83) An alternative to PPP that shifts focus from teachers to students is OHE: **O**bserve, **H**ypothesise, **E**xperiment. This model uses questions, discovery techniques and noticing through which students grasp language rules. (Harmer, 2001: 83-4)

ESA model: **E**ngage, **S**tudy, **A**ctivate can follow a number of procedures. In basic ESA students are first emotionally engaged into an activity by games, pictures, stories, anecdotes etc. so that they are prepared to benefit as much as possible from the following stages. In the second stage, students can study a construction and think about it in a variety of ways: the practice promoted by PPP, discovery activities or others. The third stage encourages learners to use language freely as in a real life situation. Instead of forcing students to focus consciously on an accurate use of the new language, they are told to react to a topic or to fulfil

a task by using any appropriate language that they know. (Harmer, 2007: 52-3)

Altered versions of ESA may be procedures like EAS(A) ('boomerang procedure') or combinations of several procedures and sub-procedures such as EAASASEA ('patchwork sequence') (Harmer, 2007: 54-7). The model ESA gives the teacher enough freedom to plan their lessons with regard to their students' proficiency and the type of structure discussed (Harmer, 2007: 55). Even if the teacher follows a coursebook, ESA can help them modify the activities in a clear way so that the students profit from them (Harmer, 2007: 57). In general, to introduce a new grammatical feature, it can be good to follow the basic model ESA. Nevertheless, it proves effective to change the procedure from lesson to lesson since it can help keep learners engaged. (Harmer, 2007: 54)

The alternatives to PPP follow the philosophy of the approach *focus on form* that consists in “drawing the learner's attention to linguistic forms in the context of meaningful communication” (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 10). It tries to combine strengths of both the structural and functional approaches and to compensate thus for the weak points of analytic (i.e. grammar-based) and synthetic (i.e. meaning-based) syllabuses. At the same time, it embraces the theory of the learner's interlanguage that has several stages through which the learner passes. The phases of interlanguage allow him or her to acquire a grammatical form during the stage when the student is ready to take it in. (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 5)

2.4.13 Consciousness-Raising, Noticing, Tracing

The process of consciousness-raising and noticing goes beyond Krashen's approach based on the theory of comprehensible input as sufficient for the learner to acquire the language (Harmer, 2001: 73). The initial phase of the learning process is to raise the learner's consciousness. This can be done by priming, i.e. grammar explanation that can “prime students' subsequent noticing”. In other words, it rises the chance that the learners unconsciously notice the new grammar point in later input. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 92)

Another way makes use of sufficient communicative exposure to the desired grammatical feature sometimes called tracing. The students notice new grammar and store its trace that again helps them process a future input and notice the grammar item in it. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 92) Different teachers use different means to focus their students' attention to new grammar points, e.g. using visual aids such as different fonts, contrastive colours and underscoring, or input flood texts with a high frequency of new grammar instances (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 92).

Teachers should not require immediate production of the new grammar item from their learners at the beginning of the whole process (Harmer, 2001: 73). They should allow learners to notice the grammatical feature in input and to start restructuring their implicit language system (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 6-7). It is important that students get a lot of opportunities to notice the grammar point so that they become aware of it and have numerous possibilities to compare it unconsciously with their existing grammar system (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 6-7). Learners can compare new grammar with their mother tongue grammar and deductively confirm or refute a similarity between the grammatical feature in both languages.

2.4.14 Hypothesis Testing and Scaffolding

A possibility which disregards the students' L1 knowledge works with building hypotheses about new grammar items through generalisation from examples. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 80) The students then test the new hypotheses in the input they receive and the output they produce (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 6-7). As far as the input is concerned, it was suggested that rather than to comprehensible input learners should be exposed to incomprehensible input. It stimulates restructuring of their inner grammar system to a higher degree than an input students can analyse without problems. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 90) Learners' hypothesis testing can be directed by the teacher who uses scaffolding to guide the learner to complete an output production task. Scaffolding supports the student to stay involved, reaffirms the right output and indirectly marks errors that the learner is to correct himself or herself. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 95-6) Output production can also have a form of collaborative dialogue during which the students help and reassure each other about the production of new grammar while communicating. The students contribute to their learning process when they both get and give feedback. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 94-5) The final stage of acquisition through consciousness-raising is to adjust or consolidate the new hypotheses that are converted into implicit knowledge and used by the student in communication without thinking about them (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 6-7).

2.4.15 Post-method Condition

The above mentioned presentation of selected methods and associated techniques does not, however, reflect the reality of teaching English grammar in today's classrooms. In general, a method "consists of a set of theoretical principles [...which were] derived from linguistics, L2 acquisition, cognitive psychology, information sciences etc., [...] and a specified set of classroom procedures [...which are] teaching and learning techniques

indicated by the syllabus designer and/or the material producer, and adopted/adapted by teachers and students in order to jointly accomplish the goals of language learning and teaching in the classroom” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 27).

A method thus represents a construct that is designed for a universal context where neither teachers nor students are considered entities varying in their beliefs, abilities and experience. Therefore, if we consider individual differences of educators, students and even educational environments, it is clear that a method is probably not always applied the very same way. Despite the fact teachers are sometimes trained in a method or assert that they follow a method, their actual classroom practise makes use of different procedures and even activities that are not associated with the particular method or even any method at all. (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 29-30)

Even though method is still perceived as a powerful authority in today's society, some theoreticians speak about “death of a method” and “post-method condition” where teachers have moved beyond methods and have adopted a new perspective of viewing them (Thornbury, 2011: 194). Nevertheless, existing approaches and methods are not dismissed. Even though they are regarded with a critical stance, the knowledge of methods is important and it is even used as “a foil for reflection” which helps teachers formulate consciously their own theories and form strategies which satisfy their particular classroom needs (Thornbury, 2011: 194).

Teachers sometimes claim to be eclectic in their teaching. Eclecticism is understood as combining principles and ideas of different methods that results ideally in a harmonious way of teaching. Post-method pedagogy promoters, however, object that eclectic teachers do not have any clear criteria that lead them in selection of the best ideas and techniques and that their actions are limited by the concept of method. (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 30-31) Therefore, it was suggested that for teachers it is best to be critical of their own teaching and sensitive to teaching and learning experience of other teachers and students. Moreover, it is important to have an active attitude to what works both for the teachers and their students. (Thornbury, 2011: 194) Such an experiential and experimental stance towards methods can lead to their fruitful implementation and result not in “search for an alternative method [but] an alternative *to* a method” (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 29).

3 Theoretical Background: Teacher Cognition

3.1 Language as a Form or Language as a Function

One of the central dilemmas of language pedagogy that preoccupied both reformers centuries ago and language teaching researchers in the modern time is the most effective model of grammar instruction (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 2). The position of grammar in teaching foreign languages is closely connected with the definition of language, particularly “dialectic between the function of language and its forms” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 6). Consequently, those who advocate the idea of language as a form perceive the language as “grammar structures, vocabulary words, sound/sign/sentence patterns, rules etc.” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 6). In contrast, adherents of the functional notion of language understand it as “a means of interaction or cultural transmission” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 6).

3.2 The Origins of Language Teacher Cognition Research

Throughout the history of language teaching, teachers have always based their practices on some, whether their own or adopted, beliefs about language and the purpose they saw in learning it. The trends in language teaching have had an impact on the role of grammar instruction that has oscillated between the extremes of grammar teaching playing first fiddle to being damned as unnecessary or even harmful. Teachers have therefore swung like a pendulum between these poles looking for the answers to the questions such as “how much importance they should give to grammar, what grammar they should teach and how they should teach it”. (Swan, 2006)

Understanding the position of teachers in the process of language teaching has changed quite dramatically throughout the history, especially in the past half a century. Traditionally, it was theoreticians who were seen in the centre of language pedagogy, whereas teachers occupied a position on the periphery. (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 28-29) The majority of classroom studies conducted in the 1960s and 1970s was based on the belief that “learning was seen as a product of teaching” (Borg, 2006: 6). The research was interested in the observation of teachers' behaviour in the classrooms and in establishing what aspects of the behaviour were effective for the learners. Although researchers took into account teachers' variables such as personal characteristics and education background, their cognitive processes had been disregarded at least till the 1960s. In that time, cognitive psychology research results shed light on teachers' mental processes and their value for understanding teaching processes. It was also suggested that teachers did not merely accept the theory prescribed by linguists

and education theoreticians and transfer it passively into the classrooms. On the contrary, teachers were seen as active organisms conscious of their actions and capable of critical approach and autonomous decisions. (Borg, 2006: 6-7)

In the 1980s, when the field of language teaching education started to be explored (Borg, 2011: 215-216), teacher cognition was espoused by research which suggested that teaching was not a simple linear but rather a circular process. Apart from teachers' cognition that shaped teaching, there were a lot of factors that entered into the process and influenced teachers, e.g. students' variables such as age, aptitude, classroom behaviour and other external variables such as school policy and parents' decisions. (Borg, 2006: 10-11) Consequently, teachers were seen not only as “decision-makers” but also “sense-makers” who had to operate in a classroom context that was far from sterile laboratory settings. Every school and classroom environment was formed by political, social and other factors and teachers had to react to them respectively. (Borg, 2006: 15) The classroom became also an environment where teachers' thoughts, beliefs, theories, decisions and planning entered and where teachers' actions were performed (Borg, 2006: 16-17). In other words, the classroom was the place where the theory met the reality.

To be more specific, research in some areas of ELT, e.g. teaching of writing, showed a relative consistency between teachers' implicit beliefs and practice (Borg, 1999a: 157). However, in grammar-teaching which is a rather controversial area where approaches and methods have been born, damned, re-born, restructured, replaced, fused etc., in short, an area of ELT full of controversies and no unidirectional standards (Borg, 1999a: 157), teachers' decisions appear to emerge from a complex process that sometimes results in a dissonance between teaching theories and teachers' actual practice in a classroom (Borg, 2006: 132).

3.3 The Role of Grammar Teaching in L2 Education

One of the aspects regarding teaching grammar is teachers' personal views of the role of grammar in learning English as L2 (Borg, 1999a: 158). Neither teachers nor theoreticians have concluded on the fact whether teaching grammar rules helps students acquire and later use them when they need to or whether students would internalize the grammar system to the same or even higher degree without any teachers' intervention (Swan, 2006). However, if we consider learners who learn English in organised courses and not on their own, we can assume that students enrolled in a course expect that a teacher influences their learning or that it even depends on the teacher (Andrews, 2003: 90). Similarly, there has not been a clear consensus

in favour of either explicit or implicit grammar instruction nor preference of either deductive or inductive learning. Constantly changing fashion of grammar teaching has alternated between focus on grammar during separate activities and incidental focus on grammar forms either in anticipation of a problem or as a reaction to an error. (Swan, 2006)

3.4 Teacher Language Awareness (TLA)

Teachers' adherence to either of the above mentioned options forms their personal beliefs about teaching grammar. More specifically, “beliefs are propositions individuals consider to be true and which are often tacit, have a strong evaluative and affective component, provide a basis for action, and are resistant to change” (Borg, 2011: 370-371). These beliefs are based on interaction of variables that enter into the process shaping teacher language awareness (TLA). According to Andrews (2003: 86), the concept of TLA characterises language teachers and differentiates them from proficient non-native language users or native speakers. It comprises teachers' subject matter cognitions, i.e. knowledge about language that “concerns beliefs and assumptions about the language itself [...] as well as how it is taught” that is closely related to teachers' language proficiency (Andrews, 2003: 85). Speaking about grammar teaching, linguistically aware teachers know how grammar works, are able to reflect on both their own “teachers' grammar” and “grammar for learners” including students' doubts, problems and errors and are able to address them. Moreover, such teachers know how to plan instruction and teach grammar accordingly. (Andrews, 2003: 86)

To understand what teachers focus on in teaching, how they reflect on language and grammar theories and how they control their inner factors, it is necessary to have a closer look at the variables (Andrews, 2003: 92). One of the possible factors is teachers' own declarative knowledge of grammar. Since English has become an international language, the field of English teaching has required a large number of both native and non-native teachers who can teach the language. The demand has, however, resulted in employing teachers with insufficient qualifications for the job. In 2008 Czech School Inspectorate (CSI) issued a report based on a survey in 32 Czech high schools which revealed that only 30% of English teachers in the school year 2007/2008 had received education adequate for their teaching position (CSI, 2008: 18-19). The same year's survey showed that the situation in a sample of 62 Czech elementary and secondary schools was even worse: only 23% of English teachers had received a university education in their teaching subject (CSI, 2008: 12). To compare, Andrews (2003: 82) gives an example from the Hong Kong environment where in 1991 only

“27% of graduate secondary school English teachers were subject-trained”.

This or a similar situation has become an apparent worldwide problem raising doubts whether English teachers have, besides subject-matter knowledge, a sufficient knowledge of language and hence whether they can successfully perform the role of a language analyst. (Andrews, 2003: 84) This role comprises a teacher as a proficient user of English as well as a teacher who has a high level of explicit knowledge of grammar including grammatical terminology which usually differs with native and non-native English teachers. (Andrews, 1999: 146)

A study conducted by Andrews (1999) that explored the knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology focused on non-native teachers of English, prospective teachers of both native and non-native background and non-native prospective teachers with English Studies education background. The results of a 60-item test showed that non-native teachers with an average two years' full-time teaching experience scored significantly better, though the mean score 70 per cent is probably not a brilliant result for language teachers, than the other groups of participants who had considerable gaps in their explicit knowledge of language. The group of non-native teachers, however, proved to have a poor ability to clarify grammatical errors.

Speaking about teachers' knowledge of language, we should think about its source. Results of a number of studies mentioned by Borg (2006: 112-113) showed that language courses teachers participated in during their school years were the principal source of their grammar knowledge. We can say that teachers' prior language study seems to influence teachers with regard to forming their ideas and beliefs about classroom practice (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 30). There is a possible correlation between the way teachers were taught grammar as students and the way they teach it themselves. To put it simply: if something worked with them, why could not it work with others?

It was even proposed that results of research on grammar teaching and methodological guidelines do not influence teachers as much as their own grammar experience as learners (Borg, 2006: 116) which can result in teachers' obsolete classroom techniques (Borg, 1999: 157). Teachers should not be blamed for this: as mentioned above, since grammar teaching is not firmly defined as far as methodology is concerned, teachers may have difficulties to orientate in it (Borg, 1999: 157) and when forming their personal theories they resort to the practice which they had been exposed to as students (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 30). Learning experience as students usually influences novice teachers' theories and hence their classroom

practice more strongly than theoretical strategies of instructors with some teaching experience. Proficient teachers are sensitive enough to analyse and reflect their own classroom practice and learn from it. They are autonomous to the extent that they are able to pinpoint problems in their teaching and find remedies. (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 30) Teachers who are labelled “principled pragmatists” by Kumaravadivelu (1994: 31) combine skilfully their own experience as both students and teachers with their peers' critique to devise macrostrategies, i.e. general plans through which they form microstrategies that help their students learn desired grammar effectively.

It can be assumed that teachers' knowledge of language is one of the variables that influences teachers' decisions about including or excluding grammar explanation and its form in their lessons. Andrews (2003, mentioned in Borg, 2006: 128) found a relationship between teachers' explicit grammar knowledge and their favouring either deductive or inductive way of teaching grammar: teachers with a higher level of declarative grammar knowledge preferred the inductive approach to the use of deduction prioritized by teachers who proved to have lower levels of explicit grammar knowledge.

3.5 Understanding External Variables Behind Teachers' Practice

Considering the unclear context of teaching grammar, it would not be correct to say that some teachers' theories and strategies are right whereas others are wrong. The important thing is to understand how and why they are formed. When we think about language teachers, they are not beings influenced merely by their past experience and formed by the input they received as learners. Teachers are affected also by the context within which they work: their local conditions. (Borg, 2011: 218) Despite the fact ELT methodology throughout the history has been designed uniformly and disregarded thus specifications of settings and participants, the reality of classrooms has differed from the global prescriptions (Howatt, 2004: 369). Teachers bring their beliefs and understandings of grammar into specific environments where cultural constraints, traditions, individual school or classroom variations etc. force teachers to reflect on their inner mental theories and react to the peculiarities. Therefore, it is not unusual that teachers who change school where they teach modify their theories and also adjust their practice. (Borg, 2006: 129)

Inside the classrooms, teachers' beliefs about teaching grammar meet or sometimes clash with local variations given by specific groups of learners. At high schools, teachers deal with teenage learners who have characteristics of the worst and the best learners at the same

time. Unlike young children, adolescents are able to understand abstract issues and, even though they may need assistance, they are able to figure out things that teachers do not give them explicitly. (Harmer, 2001: 39) However, like adult learners, most teenagers do not acquire language subconsciously and, therefore, they benefit from grammar teaching (Harmer, 2001: 72). Teenage learners may be difficult to deal with because their motivation to learn might be low and the way to provoke their interest in grammar may be challenging (Harmer, 2001: 39).

As in other subjects, some students are more talented than others. Apart from aptitude, teachers should pay attention to students' characteristics such as "independence, ego-involvement, goal-orientation and making benefit of errors" (Harmer, 2001: 42) when considering the ways of teaching a language and its grammar (Harmer, 2001: 41-2). It is more than probable that a teacher encounters pupils with different learning styles in one classroom. If teachers notice students' learning characteristics and take them into account during grammar teaching, they might prove beneficial for the learning process. (Harmer, 2001: 43) Learners have been classified traditionally as visual, aural and kinaesthetic types (Ur, 1996: 12) but we can also say that there are individuals who tend to prefer a direct approach, who like to receive explicit grammar rules, who like to be employed in discovery activities etc. (Harmer, 2001: 43). Students' proficiency is certainly a learner variable that makes teachers adjust their decisions about grammar instruction. Generally, teachers tend to employ simpler and even more monotonous activities with beginners (e.g. drills, chorus repetitions) than with more proficient students. (Harmer, 2001: 45)

Another students' variable that can either facilitate or make teachers' forming decisions about teaching, including grammar instruction, more difficult is students' motivation (Harmer, 2001: 51) that is considered by some equally or even more important than learners' aptitude in the process of learning (Ur, 1996: 275). Children often want to engage into learning just because they like learning new things unlike many high-school learners who are usually motivated by external factors such as passing a course test or a university entrance exam test (Ur, 1996: 276). There are, however, learners who do not want to learn grammar and then it is mainly teachers' task to show to which extent they themselves believe that grammar structures deserve a place in learners' language education. If so, they should give students meaningful reasons why mastering grammar is good and make it as attractive as possible. (Swan, 2006) For teachers to be able to do this successfully in a long term, it is vital that they find clear answers to the questions 'what it means to master grammar' and 'what is the best way students

can learn grammar' (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 6).

In practice, rather than theorize teachers may like to engage students into carefully-designed tasks that make learners use desired grammar. It is necessary to bear in mind that the tasks need to have a clear goal since learners tend to be attentive only to meaningful exercises. Nevertheless, what may seem positively stimulating to some might be obscure or boring for others. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 152-3) If students get activated, it is important that they are rewarded since a perceived success can keep them motivated for further work. Even though learners do not get everything right, teachers can sustain their motivation by a positively formulated reply, a positive gesture etc. that nourish learners' confidence and help them adopt a positive attitude towards grammar learning. This tactics does not want to say that teachers should oversee students' errors. Learners must accept their occasional failures as a part of learning and it is up to teachers to select the best way for this process. (Ur, 1996: 278)

3.6 Grammar Teaching Models

Nowadays, teaching and learning different aspects of language has a common goal of building up learners' ability to use the language in communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 6). Teachers have two most basic options how to achieve the goal: either they can present learners with language units, i.e. grammatical structures which students first learn and then use as cornerstones to develop their communicative competence, or teachers can do it other way round – they give students language which the learners have to analyse to get to the structures. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 10)

The former means of teaching grammar is followed by synthetic syllabi and is usually connected with the traditional practice which is said to be dangerous because students can get entangled into rules and exceptions, get lost and eventually get disinclined to learn the language (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 11-12). However, this model of grammar teaching can serve well to raise learners' awareness of grammar properties (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 37) and has an advantage of giving students feeling of accomplishment, progress and security (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 7). Teachers do not require that learners memorize grammar rules but that they understand and view grammar holistically as a system they can interact with (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 37).

The latter approach forms a basis of analytic syllabi and advocates teaching grammar implicitly (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 11-12). This form of learning can be very effective because it “activates the intuitive heuristics of the learner” (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 36). If students are

able to define grammar rules themselves they can remember them better than if they were served by teachers. However, this way can be very time-consuming and discouraging for some less analytically-thinking students. (Ur, 1996: 83)

Even though the two above-mentioned views follow different concepts of teaching and learning grammar, they still operate on one line, just in opposite directions. A more dynamic view of grammar was proposed by Larsen-Freeman (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 143) who coined the term “grammaring” to present a concept of grammar as a tool that can empower users to “present [themselves] to the world” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 142). In grammaring that is viewed as “the fifth skill,” grammar has expanded from the dimension of knowledge, e.g. rules and exceptions, to the dimension of action and use that comprises “accuracy, meaningfulness and appropriateness” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 143). This approach promotes “integrated nature of language [...where] syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features cannot be understood as isolated linguistic components” (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 38). Therefore, students are made aware of forms (i.e. rules) and reasons (i.e. meaning and use) at the same time (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 143). In other words, grammaring enables students to see how the grammar system and its parts work, why they can or cannot work in a certain way and, moreover, how to master the system in order to use it freely and creatively (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 58).

3.7 Grammar Teaching Strategies

Based on their personal theories, teachers may prefer one of the above-mentioned models of teaching grammar or decide to combine them. In practice, they also have to think about a system of selection and ordering particular grammar structures so that they can present them to their students in reasonable doses. Some teachers sort grammar items according to complexity and consequently teach simple structures before the complex ones. Other teachers think that knowledge of certain grammar items is necessary for learning other structures and, therefore, they present the structures in a corresponding order. Another option is to begin with structures that are necessary for learners to start using the language, e.g. the verb be and the present simple tense. Some teachers may also consider the hierarchy of structures that are necessary for an interaction in the language, i.e. they take into account the discourse dimension. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 144)

Even though all these strategies look tidy and logical, they are, however, models of pedagogical grammar that do not quite correspond with the way students acquire grammar

(Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 144). Learners of various levels of proficiency do not think about the whole grammar system of the language they study, they work with a system that consists of the structures they have at disposal (Swan, 2006). Some think that learning grammar is piling structures bit by bit similar to building a wall. In fact, it is more convenient to imagine the process of grammar learning as planting a garden that changes through seasons but it is all the time viewed as a whole, not as a collection of individual flowers. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 144-5)

In order to develop a grammar system in learners naturally, teachers with a highly developed language awareness are sensitive to their students' performance and look out for moments when they are ready to acquire new structures. Therefore, teachers should be careful not to introduce all information about structures (form, meaning and use) at the same time, e.g. in the course of one lesson. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 44) They can, for example, introduce the dimensions of a grammatical structure successively (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 46) or, since the dimensions of form, meaning and use are interconnected, they can aim students' attention to the problematic dimension while working with the others (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 45). Understanding meaning of grammatical structures may be more difficult than learning their form (Ur, 1996: 76), therefore, teachers should think about appropriate strategies to allow students to develop the skill. In general, they should let “students' learning guide the teaching rather than vice versa” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 145). A coursebook syllabus can thus be approached as a 'presyllabus' that is modified and extended on the go in cooperation of both teachers and learners (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 33).

Observation of students should concentrate not only on what they perform, i.e. structures they use during speaking and writing tasks, but also on structures they do not employ despite the fact they should already be part of students' repertoire. If teachers monitor their students carefully, they can detect their uncertainties and help them overcome difficulties. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 145) Even though some grammar structures can be grasped very quickly by some students, more often it is necessary that learners are exposed to the input that provides a lot of examples of the target structure used in different contexts. Together with ample opportunities to become sensitive to the form, meaning and use, students need practice activities that help them test their hypotheses and internalize the logic underlying grammatical structures (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 42-3) and thus enable them to express the desired meaning accurately and appropriately (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 51).

3.8 Models of Learning Grammar

Perhaps every teacher inclines to some theory of learning that projects into activities they select for their students. Teachers who are trying to implement Vygotsky's concept of scaffolding rely on the fact that students can learn a lot from interaction with the instructor or their peer learners. Through supportive conditions and simplification students get into 'a zone of proximal development' (ZPD) (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 88) where they can modify their current grammar system and “outperform their present competence” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 90).

A different model that contributes to the development of students' fluency operates with the idea of language chunks. It assumes that learners acquire fixed and semi-fixed units of language like when they acquire vocabulary. Similar to what native speakers do, students analyse the expressions and infer grammar rules that help them produce new language structures that may be later relexicalised and used by students as pre-fabricated pieces of language. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 83)

Another way of learning grammar is comparison of learning grammar to skill learning. It is based on the theory that students first acquire declarative knowledge about a grammar structure which is later transformed into procedural knowledge, i.e. knowledge 'how' to use the structure. Eventually, learners automatize the procedural knowledge and are able to use it without too much thinking. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 106-7)

3.9 Grammar Practice

Since instructors generally have a free hand as regards the choice of practice activities and exercises for their students, Larsen-Freeman (2003: 117) proposes three basic criteria teachers should meet when selecting or devising them: they need to be meaningful, engaging and focused on the target grammatical structure. In addition, students should get opportunity to practice as much as possible, activities should be success-oriented (i.e. students are able to fulfill expectations of a task) and at the same time reasonably challenging for the whole class (Ur, 1996: 22). Teachers should choose type of practice in harmony with the goal of teaching grammar so that they prevent students from learning merely how to construct grammar structures in a test and not being able to use it in a free conversation (Ur, 1996: 83).

Ideally, practice should make students feel as if they were communicating in real life situations (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 120). The authentic conditions when students are indirectly invited to use grammar, e.g. tasks or discussions on a selected topic, can be beneficial mostly

for more proficient students (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 121-2) and at later practice stages (Ur, 1996: 83). Learners with lower levels of grammar proficiency who would lose motivation require facilitating activities (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 121-2). In general, more controlled exercises (e.g. various types of drills) help students consolidate the form of grammar structures and are therefore usually employed before meaning-focused activities (Ur, 1996: 83-4). If it is necessary, teachers should offer their own or their classmates' assistance to students (e.g. through scaffolding) rather than demand independent production. Moreover, beginners should get more time to prepare an answer and/or an opportunity to write a draft for a speaking activity. It is also better for them if teachers speak slower, use shorter sentences, do not include formulaic language into instruction etc. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 121-2)

3.10 Grammatical Errors

An important part of teachers' pedagogical practice is attention to learners' errors. Failures during learning process occur as a natural part of grammar and language acquisition and, therefore, should not be prevented as it was proposed by behaviourism-based approaches (Hinkel and Fotos, 2008: 22). For practical purposes, students' failures are sometimes divided into three categories. The least serious ones are *slips* that are usually caused by external factors such as tiredness and can be thus corrected by the learners without anybody's assistance. *Errors*, in contrast, indicate imperfections and require explanation. *Attempts* indicate that the learner is not able to convey a message in the target language because he or she still misses some information in his or her interlanguage. Attempts are, therefore, rather informative about the student's progress and should not be necessarily followed by explanation like errors. (Harmer, 2001: 99) Nonetheless, Ur (1996: 85) points out that it is usually difficult for teachers to classify learners' incorrect expressions during a lesson and, therefore, she rejects any such division as useless.

Generally, errors are caused by L1 interference or by restructuring of the learner's interlanguage (Harmer, 2001: 99-100). Taking into account the nature of errors, Larsen-Freeman (2003: 123) suggests that teachers should distinguish the traditional error correction which refers to a language norm from feedback that is a more neutral term reflecting language acquisition as a process. Feedback is "information available to learners" (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 124) which can be positive or negative, direct or indirect, explicit or implicit (e.g. reformulation) and self-generated or produced by others (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 123). Ur (1996: 244) distinguishes two kinds of feedback: formative and summative. The former type

is more important for students' learning since it forms them and improves their use of grammar. Summative evaluation, in contrast, gives only information about students' situation or progress at a specific point in time.

What kind of feedback to give and whether any feedback at all has been a widely discussed topic. One of the important factors teachers should think of is the type of activity during which an error occurs. An oral error is mostly corrected orally and written error usually in a written form. (Ur 1996: 246) If a student makes a grammatical error during a fluency activity, some say the best thing teachers can do is to take note of the error and correct it in a way that least disrupts student's fluency development, e.g. correct the mistake at the end of the exercise or even later. If, however, the error results in a confusion of the delivered message, the teacher can intervene but again he should try to be as unobtrusive as possible. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 133)

Another important aspect teachers should think about in error non-/correction is whether students are able to acquire grammar that eliminates a particular error. It is perhaps unnecessary for students' language development to explain a grammatical structure that is still beyond their developmental level. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 127) Consequently, errors in emergent forms, i.e. new grammatical structures that students start using and thus build hypotheses about can be easily affected and, therefore, should be in focus of teachers' feedback and potential additional explanation. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 131) Teachers should be careful also about fossilized errors. Even though grammar necessary to remove an error should be available to students in their interlanguage and thus requires correction, teachers should think of various ways of doing it so that the students do not lose motivation and pay attention to restructuring their interlanguage. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 127 and 129)

3.11 Post-error Feedback

After teachers decide about whether, when and what type of errors to correct, they should consider the type of feedback and the way they deliver it with respect to learners and a specific situation. So that students learn from the feedback, it is important that they get a chance to correct themselves. (Harmer, 2001: 106) Teachers can encourage them to do so in a variety of ways:

i) by clarification requests, i.e. the teacher asks the student to repeat and together with rising intonation and some expressions (e.g. "Sorry?") lets them know about an error (Nassaji and Fotos, 76),

ii) by echoing, i.e. the teacher repeats a part of student's utterance that contains an error (e.g. "Yesterday you GO to bed late?") (Harmer, 2001: 106),

iii) by direct elicitation, i.e. the teacher informs the student about an error (e.g. "That's not right." or "Do you think it's correct?") (Harmer, 2001: 106) or repeats only a part of utterance that is correct and lets the learner finish it using the correct form (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 77),

iv) by non-verbal feedback, i.e. mimics or gestures that indicate a flaw, e.g. a shaking hand (Harmer, 2001: 106),

v) by metalinguistic feedback, i.e. the teacher gives a hint saying e.g. "word order", "catch is the present simple tense, you need a past tense" (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 77).

If students struggle to correct themselves, teachers can reformulate the erroneous utterance. A very common reaction to errors is recast. A teacher reacts to an error immediately by giving a correct version of what a student has just said and does so in a non-invasive way as in a natural dialogue, e.g. a question:

S: Yesterday I have a birthday party.

T: You HAD a birthday party?

S: Yes, I had.

If learners respond to the feedback by 'uptake,' e.g. they repeat the correct form, there is a chance they noticed it. However, teachers should check later if students did not just imitate instructors' speech. (Nassaji and Fotos, 2011: 74-75) They can also decide to use other forms of direct feedback and differentiate the correct version from the error through contrast (e.g. not *he have*, but *he has*), intonation (e.g. *he HAS an apple*), or grammar explanation, (e.g. we say *I have, you have, we have, they have* but *he/she/it has*) (Harmer, 2001: 107). Feedback delivery can be modified when teachers ask other students to correct their classmate's error. If the students are willing to cooperate and if there is a friendly atmosphere, everybody in the classroom can learn from the error. (Harmer, 2001: 107)

Research has shown that learners, in general, want to receive feedback, sometimes even more than the teachers would think (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 126). However, teachers should be careful about balancing praising and criticism since neither alone motivates students (Harmer, 2001: 100-101). It is also important to point out not only what is wrong but also what is right since both contribute to students' hypotheses reinforcement (Ur, 1996: 242). In addition, teachers may like to clarify the reason for the feedback they give (Harmer, 2001: 101) because it can show meaningfulness of correction to students. Students' motivation

increases if teachers show interest in learners and their learning process, e.g. when they do not praise without a reason (Harmer, 2001: 101) and if instructors do not consider errors to be failures but treat them as interlanguage development indicators (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 123).

3.12 Use of Students' L1

Recently there has been quite a lot of discussion about whether teachers should use their students' mother tongue during English lessons. A plausible argument advocating the use of L1 can be seen in the fact that students learn L2 and that it is a natural thing to make sense of it through the language they know best – their L1 (Harmer, 2001: 131). Those who ban the use of L1 in the classrooms assert that students should be exposed to a maximally possible amount of L2 input including grammatical explanations, instructions and clarifications (Harmer, 2001: 132).

It is true that students must use the target language to learn it, however, translations and brief explanations in L1 especially at elementary and intermediate levels might be sometimes more efficient and time-saving than lengthy elaborations and paraphrases. On the other hand, teachers should not overuse L1 otherwise students might not feel encouraged to use the target language when they are supposed to. In order to make the use of L1 beneficial to learning, students should know when they are allowed to use it. The same must be valid for teachers, e.g. they may switch to L1 when the class discusses a grammatical structure or an error but they should probably avoid it during practising grammar in the course of a task. (Harmer, 2001: 132) A lot of teachers try to make the learning process as authentic as possible in the sense of creating an English environment in the classroom (Harmer, 2001: 133). This and other techniques can help students understand that L1 is just a supportive tool both they and teachers reach for only when it is necessary.

3.13 Coursebooks and Other Teaching Materials

Just as there are no strict regulations on the use of L1 in English classrooms, teachers do not usually have to follow any orders as for what materials to use for presentation and practice activities. Nonetheless, they mostly reach for a coursebook that is an easily accessible source of texts, exercises, games etc. Nowadays, most coursebooks are designed universally for a very large spectrum of students which means that they do not take into account many local variables such as learners' native language background. Since teachers always work with particular students, they inevitably have to reflect their specific needs that should manifest in the work with a coursebook.

It was suggested that the degree of TLA affects instructors' ability to take a critical stance on coursebooks and other teaching materials. Teachers with a well-developed TLA know how to transform their explicit knowledge about grammar into effective input for particular learners. Similarly, such teachers are able to work with various instructional materials in a harmony with their personal beliefs and their students' general as well as specific or temporary learning needs. Metalinguistically-aware teachers do not follow blindly everything that is in the coursebook but examine it carefully to realize what pieces are useful for their students. (Borg, 2006: 120) For instance, teachers can modify the way of grammar presentation suggested by a coursebook or use listening, oral and other types of exercises for grammar teaching (Andrews, 2003: 90). Teachers can also be selective, e.g. if students have a problem with the use of a grammatical structure during speaking, teachers decide which exercises are suitable to help learners and which should be left for later (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 119). In general, in the course of learning, teachers should avoid exercises that have character of short check tests but instead they can provide students with activities that enable them learn (Ur, 1996: 188).

A more global issue concerning coursebooks that teachers should reflect on is the overall organisation and layout of grammar items in the book and the individual units. During planning, teachers should decide if the inner syllabus of the coursebook matches the syllabus of their courses. If not, teachers can either suggest a different coursebook or adapt it to the course needs. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 147) They can, for example, leave out or skip some structures and return to them after other structures are learnt (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 147) or do it the other way round – they can follow the coursebook and use the course syllabus as a check-list (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 146). Some teachers, if they are allowed to by their institution, refuse using a coursebook and prefer to use their own materials or to combine parts of various coursebooks for teaching grammar. This decision can be a good alternative of monotonous techniques but requires a good organization and, therefore, may sometimes result in students' confusion and feeling that teachers are not serious about the process of learning. (Ur, 1996: 193)

3.14 Use of Metalinguistic Terminology

Another issue teachers consider during teaching grammar is the employment of metalinguistic terminology that is included in modern L2 coursebooks. Scheffler and Cinciala (2011: 22) supported its value when they suggested that terminological description improves

“accurate discussions about English grammar” and that it helps learners “to notice in the input some of the formal L2 features they have been taught and use them to make sense of this input”. Mothejzíkóvá (1988: 96) is in favour of the use of terminology when she speaks about disadvantages of SLT that presents grammar points without any metalinguistic formulations and thus makes it difficult for the teacher to “check whether students have internalized the correct rule, a partial rule or no rule at all”.

In reality, teachers seem to differ in viewing the value of metalinguistic labels: some consider them useful, some think they are unnecessary and prefer that their students know how and when to use grammatical phenomena, and others describe them as superfluous burden for the students (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 97-8). There is even a research-based suggestion that students at secondary and university level can manage with only five metalinguistic terms: noun, verb, pronoun, subject and object (Borg, 1999b: 97). On the whole, language teaching researchers agree on the fact that variables such as students' L2 proficiency, L1 education background, age and cognitive style should play role in decision-making about whether or not and to what extent to include grammatical terminology in particular classrooms (Borg, 1999b: 98-99).

3.15 “Teach Students, Not Grammar”

School education is based on the assumption that lessons given by teachers contribute to students' learning though it is perhaps generally acceptable that learning can occur also outside a classroom (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 7). Not only because they are given limited time and cannot thus cover all grammar system, teachers should keep in mind that rather than teach grammar, they should teach students (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 154). The essence of successful grammar teaching is to create classroom conditions where they can nourish in learners a positive and active attitude to grammar. Teachers should encourage students to view grammar not as a rigid system with only one right answer every time but as a space where learners can formulate and test their hypotheses to discover different meanings and uses of structures and where they can learn from their own or other learners' errors. (Larsen-Freeman, 2003: 154)

3.16 Teachers' Roles

Though various handbooks, coursebooks and other materials usually direct teachers and show them how to teach grammar, teachers are autonomous to the extent given by their institution and teaching results to be subjective in the end. On the one hand, teachers are proficient speakers of English. On the other hand, they use their knowledge of and about

language to do the activity of teaching grammar where they can decide to play different roles. Either they can be “passive technicians” and hence adopt a position of passive mediators who channel a coursebook content to students without any modifications (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 8), or they can be “reflective practitioners” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 9) who evaluate coursebook prescriptions critically. A reflective practitioner thinks about the use of the coursebook content in a particular classroom and shapes it so that it is as effective as possible for the learners. Besides being able to anticipate, this kind of teacher looks back in their teaching, identifies and reflects problems, looks for solutions and tests them. (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 9-12)

As mentioned above, teachers' beliefs and cognitions about teaching and learning grammar are of great importance to actual classroom practice. Since the process of teachers' reasoning depends on variables such as teachers' past experience as language learners, their university studies, teaching experience as well as many external variables, there are hardly two teachers who could be labelled identically. Therefore, it is more convenient to treat the roles as two extremes of a scale and assume that teachers incline towards one or the other. (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 17)

4 Methodology

4.1 Participants

The subjects of the study were in-service teachers who teach English at Czech high schools¹. The schools were searched on the internet on the website *Střední školy* (<http://www.stredniskoly.cz/seznam-skol/>) that lists Czech high schools and their websites. Teachers' contact e-mail addresses were searched on randomly-chosen school websites. Teachers were contacted directly by the researcher via e-mail including a short introduction of the researcher, the study, its aim and the link to the online questionnaire. In total, more than 500 teachers were contacted as it was assumed every fifth to tenth addressed teacher would complete the whole questionnaire. Within four weeks (10 Oct 2014 – 6 Nov 2014) 94 completed questionnaires were received. In the end, data from 93 questionnaires, which represent a 38.6% response rate, were used for the purpose of the analysis. One questionnaire had been removed from the sample since most questionnaire items where the respondent could write their own answer were answered by a meaningless row of numbers. On the whole, the sample size exceeds the minimal number of 50 respondents generally required for a study with statistically significant results (Dörnyei, 2009: 62).

4.2 The Research Instrument

The aim of the research part of the thesis was to explore Czech high-school teachers' beliefs and their actual classroom practices concerning English grammar teaching. The study was conducted with the purpose of answering the main research question which was divided into several sub-questions:

What importance and role do teachers give to teaching English grammar with respect to their students?

What teachers state about their actual classroom practice, particularly regarding:

- their grammar teaching approach
- grammar practice
- grammatical error correction
- the use of L1 in teaching grammar
- the use of coursebooks

¹ The population of high school teachers was limited to those teaching at both state-funded and private *gymnázium* (comparable to grammar schools) and *střední odborná škola* (comparable to vocational schools). English teachers teaching at *střední odborná učiliště* (comparable to training schools) were not included.

In order to receive a satisfactory amount of analysable data, it was decided to use an online questionnaire¹ as the main instrument. This decision was preceded by the original idea to base the study on a number of interviews with teachers and observations in the teachers' English lessons. A trial interview was done with a Czech high-school teacher who the researcher knows personally. Some of the received data proved valuable, however, it became evident that, for the sake of the research validity, the study should be based on a higher number of interviewees/respondents than originally intended five teachers. Therefore, the form of a questionnaire appeared to be the most suitable instrument. The questionnaire² is partly an adapted version of two questionnaires: a questionnaire used by Burgess and Etherington (2002) in their study "Focus on Grammatical Form: Explicit or Implicit?" and a questionnaire used by Ezzi (2012) in his study "Yemeni Teachers' Beliefs of Grammar Teaching and Classroom Practices". These questionnaires were revised, the questions that appeared suitable for the current research were selected, modified and translated to Czech. In addition, several questions were added by the researcher.

4.3 Pilot Questionnaire

The first version of the questionnaire³ included 63 close-ended items, one open-ended question, one question where the respondent could tick either one of three suggested answers or write down their own answer, and four factual questions that inquired about respondents' received education, years of teaching experience and the type of educational institution where they teach English. This questionnaire form was used as a pilot version that was completed by six former or current students of English and American Studies⁴ who teach English at Czech language schools. Moreover, the questionnaire was consulted with the thesis supervisor.

The pilot study provided valuable feedback as for the questionnaire as a whole, e.g. the respondents reported they had no problems with the length of the questionnaire. The respondents also pointed to several items that seemed biased or were difficult to understand. The statements concerned were rephrased and consequently consulted with the thesis supervisor and two other English and American Studies students. Further, two respondents recommended adding the central option *neutral* or *don't know* to the four-point Likert scale

1 The questionnaire was created and published online through the questionnaire software <http://www.vyplnto.cz/>.

2 See Appendix II.

3 See Appendix I.

4 The respondents were MA students or graduates of English and American Studies at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague.

strongly disagree – disagree – agree – strongly agree. One respondent, in contrast, noted that absence of the central point which generally many people tend to choose makes respondents think about the question. This was also the researcher's reason for using a four-point scale which, moreover, proved to be effective in Ezzi's (2012) study compared to a five-point scale that led to a lower benefit during the analysis and discussion in Burgess and Etherington's (2002) study.

The final form of the questionnaire was further influenced by the fact three out of six respondents in the pilot sample added comments into the boxes where they marked one of the suggested answers despite the fact they were clearly instructed only to tick answers. The comments usually included respondents' description and specification of the context of their answers. The researcher was aware of the fact the questionnaire items were de-contextualised. Nevertheless, since teachers from the population, which the study focuses on, work in different teaching environments, rather than to narrow the context respondents were encouraged to describe it in their comments. Even though it was not the original intention, respondents were given the option either to select one of the given answers on the four-point Likert-scale or write their own answer in the space provided in 34 items (out of 68 behavioural and attitudinal questions in total in the final version of the questionnaire). This form of the questionnaire thus served to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data. Some changes were done also in the final part of the questionnaire where respondents were asked to write their age as well as to give more details about their education¹. This information was used to observe a potential relationship between respondents' beliefs and reported classroom practice, and their qualification and years of teaching experience.

4.4 Final Form of the Questionnaire

Questionnaire participants were assured of confidentiality of their provided data at the very beginning of the questionnaire as suggested by Dörnyei (2009: 16). No personal names nor participants' gender were asked for. Any reference to the participants as a man/woman in the analytical part was deduced from the participants's reactions or assigned randomly. Being aware of the fact respondents put a considerable effort into answering the questionnaire items, they were offered the option to write their e-mail address at the end of the questionnaire with the promise to send them a brief summary of the current research results.

¹ Personal/classification questions were placed at the end of the questionnaire in order not to discourage participants from completing the questionnaire as suggested by Dörnyei (2009: 46).

The final form of the questionnaire¹ is comprised of 77 items. The first 25 statements ask the respondents about their beliefs concerning teaching and learning English grammar in general. Items 26 to 33 ask about respondents' experience with their students' learning English grammar. These 33 items include categories: the way students learn English grammar (items 1-3, 26, 33), the importance and role of grammar within teaching and learning English (items 4-8, 30, 32), grammar teaching approaches (items 9-11, 27), grammar practice (items 13-18, 28, 29, 31) and grammatical errors (items 12, 19-25). Question 34 asked teachers about their grammar teaching approach: whether they employ inductive instruction, deductive instruction, both approaches or neither of them. If the teacher marked the last option mentioned, they were redirected to question 35 where they were asked to describe their approach. The first three options redirected the respondent to question 36.

Statements 36 to 51 present a set of fifteen strategies that can be used in teaching grammar. The respondents were asked to mark how often they employ the strategies on a four-point scale. Statements 52 to 67 comprise the same set of strategies as in 36 to 51 but this time the respondents were asked to rate their effectiveness on a four-point scale. The aim of the statements 36 to 67 was to explore teachers' actual classroom practice, particularly with respect to: the use of L1 (Czech) in grammar teaching (statements 36/52, 41/57), grammar teaching approaches (37/53, 38/54, 40/56, 43/59-47/60), grammar practice (42/58, 51/67), grammatical errors correction (39/55, 48/64) and the use of coursebooks (49/65, 50/66). Voluntary question (68) encouraged respondents to describe their grammar teaching method. This open-ended question proved to be a rich source of qualitative data despite the fact it was not answered by all the respondents. Teachers's descriptions that were found to include a lot of details provided by eight participants were analysed separately and the rest was analysed in groups with respect to the issues mentioned. The rest of the questionnaire items comprised one behavioural question (69) which asked respondents to write down and/or to select one of the suggested factors that influenced the way they teach English grammar and eight factual questions (69-77) that asked participants to provide some personal data.

1 See Appendix II.

5 Data Analysis

The following section presents findings based on both quantitative and qualitative data received from the questionnaires completed by Czech high-school teachers of English.

5.1 Typical Respondent

The typical respondent was found to be 42 years old. He or she has more than ten years of teaching experience and teaches English at a grammar school. The typical respondent received his or her master's degree (the highest completed level of education) in teaching English in combination with another subject at a teacher training faculty in 1999. The typical participant stated that the way he or she teaches grammar was influenced especially by his or her own experience with teaching students, teacher's books and coursebooks used in the lessons and an English teacher during his or her own studies at a language/elementary/high school.

5.2 Analysis of Questionnaire Items

5.2.1 The Way Students Learn Grammar

The first area considered deals with the teachers' beliefs about how students learn English grammar. The first two statements of the questionnaire tried to discover whether the teachers think that *students can learn grammar without a teacher (1)* and whether *students acquire grammar best through contact with the language and natural communication in English (2)*. The respondents' reactions to statement (1) showed a slightly stronger tendency towards (strong) disagreement (48; 51.6%) than (strong) agreement (38; 40.8%) with it. Two of the teachers who decided to comment on this statement rather than mark one of the suggested answers noted that learning grammar is easier with a teacher who can provide students with examples, mnemonics etc. (1; 1.1%), and occasional explanation (1; 1.1%). Other teachers added comments of approval with the statement on condition that students are in a permanent contact with a native speaker (2; 2.2%) or they use a good coursebook (1; 1.1%). The rest seemed to be careful about this statement when they noted that learning grammar without a teacher depends on students' abilities (1; 1.1%) or that students can get only an intuitive knowledge of grammar without a teacher (1; 1.1%).

The respondents' reactions to statement (2) suggest that almost one half (45; 48.4%) of the teachers think ((strongly) agreed) that communication in the target language is the best

way for English language acquisition. The second half of the respondents either disagreed (38; 40.9%) or agreed partly (9; 9.7%) with the statement, which they explained: a few teachers (6; 6.5%) pointed out the necessity of explicit grammar rules and controlled practice activities for students' ability to communicate in the language and to reach higher language levels, one (1; 1.1%) teacher emphasized the teacher's role which reinforces the tendency suggested by statement (1) and two (2; 2.2%) teachers considered students' different learning styles (e.g. 'some students prefer to learn grammar rules'). It was further observed that more than one half (30 out of 53) of the participants who disagreed with statement (1) disagreed also with statement (2) and more than one half (24 out of 39) of participants who agreed with statement (1) agreed with statement (2).

Statements (3) and (33) asked the respondents whether, in general, they believe in *students' ability to learn grammar structures as fixed or semi-fixed phrases* (3) and whether *their students make use of this model of learning grammar for subsequent inference of grammar rules* (33). The quantitative data suggest that around 63% of the teachers (strongly) agreed with the fact that students can learn grammar as (semi-)fixed units. Moreover, qualitative data rather support teachers' agreement with this statement (3) since additional 8 (8.6%) respondents agreed that some types of students can learn some grammatical features this way. Five (5.4%) of these respondents further commented on the necessity to understand underlying grammar rules of the language chunks. In contrast, two (2.2%) respondents seem to be sceptical as far as some of their students' ability to infer rules from (semi-)fixed units is concerned. These additional reactions to statement (3) somehow correspond to 38%¹ of the teachers who state that some of their students occasionally learn grammar this way and later infer grammar rules from the expressions (33).

The last statement (26) asked the respondents to rate their *beliefs about their students' abilities to understand and remember grammar*. Most (64; 68.9%) teachers (strongly) disagreed with the statement which indicates the teachers' positive appraisal of their students. The qualitative data suggest that the statement is valid for some of the respondents' students (6; 6.5%). Other respondents (3; 3.2%) wrote that if students are not able to understand and remember grammar, the teacher is to blame since he or she is unable to provide enough space for students to 'absorb' grammar. Other comments showed neither agreement nor disagreement saying that students' understanding and remembering all grammar covered in the lessons is not the teachers' aim anyway (1; 1.1%) and that forgetting what one had learnt

¹ 27% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed and 11% of respondents partly agreed adding comments that it depends on a particular grammatical feature.

and practised is natural and that knowledge of our mother tongue is not perfect either (1; 1.1%).

On the whole, the majority of the respondents believe that a teacher is important for most students' grammar learning. Teachers further suggested that even though some students can learn grammar without a teacher, they can probably do so better and more easily with some instructor's assistance. Even though there has not been theoreticians' complete agreement on this issue, teachers' reactions told us about how necessary they perceive themselves in the process of grammar teaching as well as about their positive view of their students' abilities to learn English grammar.

In addition, it can be seen that while one half of the participants think the implicit approach is the best way of learning grammar (i.e. in a natural communication in the language), the second half of the teachers do not share this view which a few of them explain by the benefit of explicit grammar rules and controlled grammar practice. As far as the idea of learning grammar as language chunks is concerned, the teachers expressed a majority belief in this learning model although they claim their students do not often learn grammar that way.

Statement:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Others	Invalid	Total (% rounded)
<i>(1) Students can learn grammar without a teacher.</i>	7 7.5%	41 44.1%	31 33.3%	7 7.5%	7 7.5%	– –	93 100%
<i>(2) Students acquire grammar best through a contact with the language and a natural communication in English.</i>	0 0%	38 40.9%	37 39.8%	8 8.6%	9 9.7%	1 1.1%	93 100%
<i>(3) Students can acquire grammar structures as fixed or semi-fixed expressions and phrases.</i>	1 1.1%	25 27.0%	51 55.1%	7 7.6%	9 9.7%	– –	93 100%
<i>(33) My students learn grammatical features as fixed or semi-fixed expressions and phrases, which they later use to infer rules of their formation and usage.</i>	– –	51 55.1%	24 25.9%	1 1.1%	16 17.3%	1 1.1%	93 100%
<i>(26) My students do not learn all grammatical features and rules they are taught because they are unable to understand and remember them.</i>	14 15,1 %	50 53,8 %	15 16,2 %	1 1,1 %	13 14.3%	– –	93 100%

Table 1: The Way Students Learn Grammar

5.2.2 Importance of Grammar in Learning English

The second group of statements aimed to reveal the teachers' beliefs concerning the importance of grammar in learning English. The first statement *Students' knowledge of English should include, among others, a theoretical knowledge of grammar system and the way it works* (4) indicated the teachers' tendency towards (strong) agreement (62; 66.7%). Comments in qualitative data generally supported this result: the teachers emphasized the importance of theoretical knowledge of grammar especially for grammar school students and those who want to enrol at a university (6; 6.5%) and they also pointed to analytically-thinking students who generally benefit from theoretical knowledge of grammar systems (2; 2.2%).

Statement (32) asked the teachers whether *theoretical knowledge of the English grammar system gives their students feeling of security* which most (63; 67.8%) teachers (strongly) agreed with. Moreover, a few (5; 5.4%) teachers stated in their comments that understanding the grammar system is important at least for some of their students. On top of that, a pivot table showed that 44 (47.5%) of all the respondents (strongly) agreed with both statements (4) and (32) which indicates that the teachers recognize the importance of theoretical knowledge of the English grammar.

Further, the majority (77; 82.8%) of the respondents expressed that *students of all levels (beginner, intermediate, advanced) should learn grammar* (statement (7)). Unlike these positive reactions, statement (5) (*Teaching grammar should be the main part of language teaching.*) provoked 71 (76.4%) (strongly) disagreeing reactions and statement (8) (*It is important to focus on grammar during every English lesson.*) was (strongly) disapproved by 81 (87.4%) respondents.

The penultimate statement (6) within this area showed that more than a half (51; 54.8%) of teachers (strongly) disagreed with *the necessity of explicit grammar teaching for students' ability to express themselves in a grammatically correct language*. Nevertheless, 38 (40.8%) respondents, which is not an insignificant number, (strongly) agreed with the statement.

The last statement (30) discussed in this section asked respondents whether *their students use grammar terminology during English lessons (e.g. the term "past participle")*. In their reactions, more than one half (55; 59.2%) of the teachers (strongly) agreed with the statement and some (22; 23.7%) of them (strongly) disagreed. Additional comments further showed that a few (7; 7.6%) respondents teach both students who use grammar terminology

(e.g. older and more proficient students use grammar terminology) and students who do not. Several (5; 5.4%) teachers said that their students use only grammar terminology of frequently discussed grammatical items (e.g. tenses). Other (2; 2.2%) teachers then stated that they want their students to use terminology and they encourage them to do so since, for instance, the terms are used in grammar books. Lastly, some comments (2; 2.2%) also mentioned the teachers encourage students to know Czech equivalents of English terminology either instead or besides English terms.

Information obtained in this section suggests that most teachers think grammar should be taught at all proficiency levels. However, the majority of the participants do not think grammar should be the main part of language teaching nor that it should be taught in every English lesson. Besides the fact theoretical knowledge of the English grammar system is considered important and beneficial for students by many respondents, the reactions show the teachers think about their students' variables, needs and individual characteristics that presumably project into at least some of the teachers' process of decision making in teaching grammar. It was further discovered that although many teachers do, the majority do not believe explicit grammar teaching (i.e. giving students grammar rules) is important for students' ability to express themselves in a language free from grammatical errors. In addition, it can be assumed that grammar terminology is usually used by the respondents' students and its use in lessons also seems to be supported.

Statement:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Others	Invalid	Total (% rounded)
<i>(4) Students' knowledge of English should include, among others, theoretical knowledge of the grammar system and the way it works.</i>	3 3.2 %	15 15.1 %	50 53.8 %	12 12.9 %	13 14.0%	– –	93 100%
<i>(5) Teaching grammar should be the main part of language teaching.</i>	13 13,98%	58 62,37%	12 12.9 %	3 3,23 %	7 7.6%	– –	93 100%
<i>(6) Explicit grammar teaching is necessary for students' ability to express themselves in a grammatically correct language.</i>	5 5,38 %	46 49,46 %	36 38,71 %	2 2,15 %	4 4.3%	– –	93 100%
<i>(7) Students of all levels (i.e. beginner, intermediate, advanced) should learn grammar.</i>	1 1.1%	13 14.0 %	61 65.6 %	16 17,2 %	2 2.2%	– –	93 100%
<i>(8) It is important to focus on grammar during every English lesson.</i>	14 15.1 %	67 72.3 %	9 9.7 %	– –	3 3.2%	– –	93 100%

(32) <i>Theoretical knowledge of the grammar system gives my students feeling of security.</i>	–	20	62	1	8	2	93
	–	21.5 %	66.7 %	1.1 %	8.6%	2.2%	100%
(30) <i>My students use grammar terminology during English lessons (e.g. the term “past participle”).</i>	1	21	45	10	16	–	93
	1.1 %	22.6 %	48.4 %	10.8 %	17.3%	–	100%

Table 2: Importance of Grammar in Learning English

5.2.3 Grammar Teaching Approaches

The percentage of (strongly) disagreeing reactions was high especially in statement (10) where 90 (96.8%) respondents showed they do not think *grammar should be taught separately from other communicative activities*. This result can suggest the teachers' beliefs in the communicative approach. We can also assume that the teachers do not like to focus primarily on language forms but, on the contrary, they suggest students should learn grammatical features together with their meaning exposed in communication.

The majority (67; 72.1%) of (strongly) disagreeing reactions to statement (9) *teachers' main task during grammar teaching is explanation of grammar rules and exceptions* is further supported by teachers' comments. Two (2.2%) respondents reported they believe in inductive teaching design when they mention that it should not be the teacher but students who infer rules themselves while the teacher is moved to the background. He or she has a function of a facilitator who confirms students' assumptions about grammar and summarizes them. Other two (2.2%) comments suggested that grammar practice is more important than explanation. If we compare the tendency suggested by the participants' reactions to statements (9) with (4) and (32) above, we can assume that teachers believe students should know grammar rules of the English grammar system, however, the majority do not believe presentation of rules and exceptions should be the teacher's principal task in grammar teaching.

When respondents were asked whether *their students expect them to explain new grammar explicitly* in statement (27), 39 (42.0%) respondents (strongly) disagreed and 47 (50.8%) of them (strongly) agreed. Two (2.2%) teachers from the latter group stated in their comments that they do not follow their students' expectations despite the fact their students like or prefer explicit grammar explanation. When we compare these reactions to the participants' responses to statement (32), we discover that 30 (32.4%) respondents said they believe that *theoretical knowledge of the grammar system gives their students feeling of security* and, at the same time, they think that *their students expect them to explain new grammar explicitly*. In contrast, 23 (24.8%) participants stated they believe that *theoretical*

knowledge of the grammar system gives their students feeling of security but they said they do not think *their students expect them to explain new grammar explicitly*.

In order to discover *how respondents teach grammar in their English classes*, i.e. whether they prefer deductive (A.), inductive (B.), both ways of learning grammar (C.) or neither of them and thus whether they prefer a different approach (D.), they were asked to answer question (34.). Not even one out of 93 respondents characterised his or her grammar-teaching approach as a different one from those presented in the question. The frequencies showed that most respondents (72.0%) reported they make use of both deductive and inductive grammar learning, almost one quarter (22.6%) of teachers employ the inductive way and only a few (5.4%) report using the deductive way of grammar teaching. The majority (80; 86.0%) of the respondents who stated that *teachers should not start grammar teaching by a theoretical explanation of a new grammar structure (11)* reinforced the tendency and indicated that despite the fact some teachers claimed not to be in favour of deductive grammar teaching design, they employ it at least sometimes in their lessons.

The data in the section suggest that there is a strong support of 'focus on form' as opposed to 'focus on forms'. In other words, the teachers claim they present both form and meaning of grammar structures in a natural context. In addition, even though most teachers seem to think that theoretical knowledge of grammar rules should be a part of students' knowledge of language, a small number of teachers reported that rule explanation should be the teacher's main task in grammar teaching. It was further discovered that even though most teachers believe grammar rules are generally effective for their students' learning, not all of these teachers think that their students want to receive explicit grammar rules. The teachers' reactions further indicated that inductive reasoning or a combination of inductive and deductive is applied in the respondents' English grammar lessons. Moreover, the data imply that the participants tend to prefer student-focused rather than teacher-focused grammar instruction.

Statement:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Others	Invalid	Total (% rounded)
(9) <i>Teachers' main task during grammar teaching is explanation of grammar rules and exceptions.</i>	10 10.8 %	57 61.3 %	21 22.6 %	1 1.1 %	4 4.3%	— —	93 100%
(10) <i>Grammar should be taught separately from other communicative activities.</i>	33 35.5 %	57 61.3 %	3 3.3 %	— —	— —	— —	93 100%

(11) Teachers should start grammar teaching by a theoretical explanation of a new grammar structure.	19 20.4 %	61 65.6 %	7 7.5 %	2 2.2 %	4 4.3%	— —	93 100%
(27) My students expect me to explain new grammar explicitly.	1 1.1 %	38 40.9 %	42 45.2 %	1 1.08 %	11 11.9%	— —	93 100%

Table 3: Grammar Teaching Approaches

(34) How do you teach grammar in your English classes?	No. and % (rounded)
A. I first present a grammatical feature and rules to my students and then I give them examples of the usage.	5 5.4%
B. I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples.	21 22.6%
C. I employ both ways (A.) and (B.)	67 72.0 %
D. I employ neither the way (A.) nor (B.) I employ a different procedure:	— —
Total:	93 100%

Table 4: How Do You Teach Grammar in Your English Classes?

5.2.4 Grammar Practice

The next set of statements asked respondents both about their beliefs and their students' preferences with regard to selected issues in grammar practice. Generally recognized importance of grammar practice is evident from the respondents' reactions to statements (13) and (16). Almost three quarters (68; 74.2%) of the respondents (strongly) agreed with the former statement expressing that *the practice of grammatical features should be the main part of teaching grammar* (13). Additional five (5.4%) respondents emphasised in their comments the importance of practice through free activities, i.e. students' own language production. The high frequency of positive reactions to statement (13) seems to correspond with the majority (83; 89.3%) of the respondents who (strongly) agreed with statement (16) and expressed thus that they believe *regular/frequent practice of grammatical features contributes significantly to students' ability to use grammar correctly and precisely*. The above-mentioned teachers' comments on statement (13) further reinforced (strong) agreement of the majority (90; 96.8%) of the respondents with statement (15) that showed *the use of grammatical features in free communication is a necessary part of the grammar-learning process*.

One of the statements that related studied issues to the respondents' students asked

whether *their students have difficulties with the use of grammatical features in free communication* (28). More than one half (62; 66.6%) of the teachers who (strongly) agreed with the statement indicated that though the respondents think practice through free communication is necessary and it is thus probably employed in their English lessons, it seems to be hard for the students to use grammar to express themselves in discussions and other complex tasks. Some teachers' additional comments pointed out that younger and less proficient students usually have these problems (3; 3.2%) and that some grammatical features are more difficult to grasp and thus to be produced correctly in communication (4; 4.3%). If it can be assumed that grammar production in free activities is rather difficult for students, it is good to look at the teachers' reactions to statement (31) that asked them whether *their students have problems with already practised grammatical features included in authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles)*. About three quarters (69; 74.2%) of the respondents (strongly) disagreed with the statement and other two (2.2%) mentioned that it is usually not difficult for their students to notice and understand grammar that is part of their declarative knowledge.

The next area concerning grammar practice deals with the importance of context for language practice. The respondents' reactions to statement (17) showed that most (62; 66.7%) teachers think that *practice of grammatical features must always take place within a context given by a communication situation*. Four (4.3%) respondents further mentioned that grammar practice in a context is not necessary but that it is certainly helpful. Comparing the frequencies in (17) with the reactions to statement (14) asking whether *grammar practice through individual sentences is useful for grammar teaching*, we can see that 68 (73.1%) respondents consider individual sentences useful while only 13 (14.0%) ((strongly) disagreed) rejected their beneficial effect.

It was further discovered that 41 (44.3%) respondents (strongly) agreed with both statements (14) and (17). Respondents' additional comments, though they were provided by just a few teachers, also showed that some teachers consider both context-bound language and individual sentences taken out of context useful for grammar practice, however, in different learning phases, e.g. individual sentences are beneficial in initial or introductory phases (2; 2.2%) or when students have problems with some grammatical features (1; 1.1%). Two (2.2%) other teachers stated that grammar practice should take place in a context but that individual sentences are useful, too, but practice should not be limited to them.

The teachers' reactions to statement (29), which is related to statements (14) and (17),

do not imply a very clear tendency as for *students' preferences regarding examples of individual sentences during the process of learning grammar* since one half (40; 43.1%) of the respondents (strongly) disagreed and the other half (39; 42%) (strongly) agreed with the statement. Additional comments did not clarify the tendency either: four (4.3%) respondents stated that it always depends on grammar discussed and two (2.2%) respondents wrote about the need of context at least with some grammatical features and 6 (6.5%) respondents admitted they do not know their students' preferences. In a pivot table it was discovered that 35 (37.8%) respondents (strongly) agreed with both statements (14) and (29) and 28 (29.9%) respondents agreed with statement (14) but (strongly) disagreed with statement (29). These frequencies tell us that more than one third of the respondents believe individual sentences are useful in grammar practice and, at the same time, they think their students believe it, too. Nevertheless, more than one quarter of the respondents think that individual sentences are useful but they reported that their students do not.

The last statement in this area asked the teachers about grammatical drills: *practice through mechanical drill is useful for teaching and learning the language* (18). The respondents' reactions showed that more than a half (52; 55.9%) of the teachers believe in usefulness of drills. In addition, a few (11; 11.9%) teachers mentioned that drills can be effective sometimes: with some grammatical features and with some students. One (1.1%) teacher stated that although he or she does not believe in this technique, he or she is aware of its beneficial effects for some students.

Information given by the participants in this section suggests that the teachers believe in beneficial effects of frequent grammar practice that should be the main part of grammar teaching. The teachers also stated that indirect practice of grammar in free production activities is necessary though this type of practice is usually difficult for students especially with some more complex grammar items. In comparison, understanding already practised grammar items in non-adapted materials does not seem to cause problems to most students. This result tells us that the participants' students have more problems applying their procedural knowledge in tasks than their declarative knowledge, for instance, while reading newspaper articles.

It can be further assumed that a lot of teachers view situational context important for practice activities and, at the same time, they think individual sentences are useful, too. Moreover, a considerable number of participants seem to be aware of the fact whether their students like or dislike practising grammar through individual sentences. Lastly, it was

discovered that the majority of the teachers believe in practising grammar through mechanical drill. A few teachers then showed that they realize this technique may be useful with some grammar items and some students more than others.

Statement:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Others	Invalid	Total (% rounded)
(13) <i>The practice of grammatical features should be the main part of teaching grammar.</i>	3 3.2 %	14 15.1%	65 69.9 %	4 4.3 %	6 6.5%	1 1.1%	93 100%
(14) <i>Grammar practice through individual sentences is useful for grammar teaching.</i>	2 2.2 %	11 11.8 %	68 73.1 %	– –	12 13.0%	– –	93 100%
(15) <i>The use of grammatical features in free communication is a necessary part of the grammar-learning process.</i>	1 1.1 %	2 2.2 %	65 69.9 %	25 26.9 %	– –	– –	93 100%
(16) <i>Regular/frequent practice of grammatical features contributes significantly to students' ability to use grammar correctly and precisely.</i>	– –	5 5.4 %	63 67.8 %	20 21.5 %	5 5.4%	– –	93 100%
(17) <i>Practice of grammatical features must always take place within a context given by a communication situation.</i>	1 1.1 %	24 25.8 %	53 57.0 %	9 9.7 %	6 6.5%	– –	93 100%
(18) <i>Practice through mechanical drill is useful for teaching and learning the language.</i>	1 1.1 %	24 25.8 %	45 48.4 %	7 7.5 %	16 17.3%	– –	93 100%
(28) <i>My students have difficulties with the use of grammatical features in free communication.</i>	1 1.1 %	19 20.4 %	56 60.1 %	6 6.5 %	11 11.9%	– –	93 100%
(29) <i>My students prefer examples of individual sentences during the process of learning grammar.</i>	2 2.2 %	38 40.9 %	37 39.8 %	2 2.2 %	14 15.1%	– –	93 100%
(31) <i>My students have problems with already practised grammatical features included in authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles).</i>	4 4.3 %	65 69.9 %	18 19.4 %	– –	6 6.5%	– –	93 100%

Table 5: Grammar Practice

5.2.5 Grammatical Errors

Another area of statements respondents were inquired about concerns grammatical errors. The first rather general statement (12) asked the teachers whether *it is possible to change the lesson plan in order to explain or practice a grammatical feature students have problems with*. The frequencies show clearly that almost all (92; 98.9%) teachers (strongly) agreed with it. The second statement (19) asked respondents whether they believe that *explicit grammar explanation helps students correct their own errors*. More than a half (49; 52.7%) of the teachers expressed (strong) agreement with the statement and a few (4; 4.3%) of them

stated in their comments that it can work for some students. Nevertheless, more than a third (36; 38.8%) of the respondents (strongly) disagreed with the benefit of explicit grammar explanation in errors self-correction.

Statements (20) and (21) asked about correction of errors committed during oral and writing exercises and activities. As for the errors made during speaking, the majority (84; 90.3%) of the respondents expressed that *the teacher should not correct all grammatical errors students make in their speech*. As for the errors made during writing activities, more than a half (63; 68.0%) of the teachers showed they think *the teacher should highlight all grammatical errors students make in writing*. In their comments on both of these statements, some teachers (2 (2.2%) in (20) and 4 (4.3%) in (21)) noted that the activity aim – fluency or accuracy must be taken into consideration: activities focused on language accuracy require grammar correction while during fluency activities the teacher should be more tolerant of students' errors. One teacher stated that it is not helpful to interrupt a student during speaking and, therefore, a teacher should make notes about the student's errors and ask him or her for correction at the end of the activity. Two similar notes which emphasized encouraging students to self-correct appeared also in comments on statement (21).

Two further statements asked the teachers about their tolerance of grammatical errors. In their reactions to statement (23), 64 (68.8%) teachers showed a certain degree of tolerance of grammatical errors when they (strongly) agreed with the idea that *it is not necessary for students to express themselves in grammatically correct sentences if they are able to express what they desire*. Some teachers added comments in which they mentioned that their tolerance changes with the lesson goal (fluency – accuracy) (9; 9.7%) and students' proficiency (5; 5.4%), e.g. even though they can make themselves understood, older students who are about to graduate should be corrected more than younger and less proficient students. The teachers' comments on statement (23) anticipate some of the respondents' reactions to statement (24): *the teacher should correct only the errors that change the meaning of students' utterances* which 41 (44.3%) respondents (strongly) agreed with and 43 (46.5%) (strongly) disagreed with. The teachers' comments showed agreement with the statement if the activity is focused on fluency (2; 2.2%). The respondents also mentioned that students' attempted level of language proficiency must be taken into account (2.2%) when deciding about (non-)correction of grammatical errors.

An important issue in dealing with errors is preventing them. Statement (25) asked the respondents whether they think *the teacher should try to prevent students' potential errors*

during grammar explanation which more than three quarters (71; 76.3%) of the teachers agreed with. Finally, statement (22) tried to discover the teachers' opinion about students' abilities to learn English grammar: whether they believe *it is very difficult for students to avoid grammatical errors because English grammar is too complex/complicated*. More than one half (61; 65.6%) of the teachers expressed their (strong) disagreement with the statement, nevertheless, 25 (26.9%) teachers (strongly) agreed with it. Moreover, two (2.2%) teachers mentioned that not even English native speakers are able to speak and write the language without errors and, therefore, it should be attempted to minimize errors but that it is hardly possible to reach the level when a student makes no errors. One (1.1%) respondent further mentioned that a lot of errors are caused by students' L1 and another teacher stated that to use some grammar (e.g. determiners) without any errors at all is very difficult for all Czech learners of English.

The respondents' reactions in this section showed that the teachers seem to think about how, when and whether at all to correct their students' errors. Most participants reported they believe that oral activities do not require correction of all errors while written activities require highlighting all errors according to more than one half of the teachers. The teachers demonstrated that they reflect different aims (accuracy or fluency) of the activities and that they think error correction and tolerance should correspond to the aims. In general, the majority of the teachers seem to focus on their students' ability to communicate in the language and to complete tasks even if they commit grammatical errors. Moreover, timing of error correction in various activities with different aims was mentioned and thus seems to be reflected, too.

Besides error correction itself, most participants seem to believe that teachers should focus on error prevention during grammar presentation. Likewise about one half of the participants reported they are in favour of explicit grammar instruction, more than one half of the teachers claimed that they believe explanation of grammar rules can contribute to students' ability to self-correct. In addition, nearly all teachers expressed that students' problems with grammar should be dealt with even at the cost of altering the lesson plan.

Statement:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Others	Invalid	Total (% rounded)
(12) <i>It is possible to change the lesson plan in order to explain or practice a grammatical feature students have problems with.</i>	–	1	53	39	–	–	93
	–	1.1 %	57.0%	41.9 %	–	–	100%

(19) <i>Explicit grammar explanation helps students correct their own errors.</i>	2 2.2 %	34 36.6 %	46 49.5 %	3 3.2 %	8 8.6%	– –	93 100%
(20) <i>The teacher should correct all grammatical errors students make in their speech.</i>	19 20.4 %	65 69.9 %	2 2.2 %	2 2.2 %	5 5.4%	– –	93 100%
(21) <i>The teacher should highlight all grammatical errors students make in writing.</i>	4 4.3 %	16 17.2 %	59 63.7%	4 4.3 %	10 10.8%	2 2.2%	93 100%
(22) <i>It is very difficult for students to avoid grammatical errors because English grammar is too complex/complicated.</i>	7 7.5 %	54 58.1 %	22 23.7 %	3 3.2 %	7 7.6%	– –	93 100%
(23) <i>It is not necessary for students to express themselves in grammatically correct sentences if they are able to express what they desire.</i>	– –	12 12.9 %	48 51.6 %	16 17.2 %	17 18.4%	– –	93 100%
(24) <i>The teacher should correct only the errors that change the meaning of students' utterances.</i>	1 1.1 %	42 45.4%	34 36.7 %	7 7.6 %	9 9.7%	– –	93 100%
(25) <i>The teacher should try to prevent students' potential errors during grammar explanation.</i>	2 2.2 %	17 18.3 %	64 68.8 %	7 7.5 %	3 3.2%	– –	93 100%

Table 6: Grammatical Errors

5.3 Teaching Strategies in Grammar Teaching

The second group of statements attempted to discover the most/least frequently used and also the most/least effective strategies employed in grammar teaching. The respondents' reactions to 16 statements repeated in two sets provided solely quantitative data which are presented in Tables 7 and 8 below.

5.3.1 The Use of L1

The statements (36)/(52) and (41)/(57) inquired about the use of L1 in grammar teaching. Frequencies of reactions to statement (36)/(52) show that 41 (44.1%) respondents reported *using Czech during grammar teaching (e.g. translation of terms, rules explanation)* 'occasionally', 31 (33.3%) 'frequently', 19 (20.4%) 'rarely' and there were also two (2.2%) respondents who reported no use ('never') of their students' mother tongue.

As for the degree of effectiveness, the pivot table showed relationships between teachers' reported frequency of the use of Czech and the effectiveness they perceive L1 has in their grammar lessons. It was discovered that 37 (40.0%) teachers who think the use of L1 during grammar teaching is 'very(very) effectiveeffective' at the same time reported using L1

'occasionally'. Similarly, 30 (32.4%) teachers who reported they use Czech 'frequently' also marked this strategy as '(very) effective' for their students. Further, 13 (14%) teachers who said they use Czech rarely also stated the use of L1 is 'effective' (11; 11.9%) or 'very effective' (2; 2.2%).

Reactions to the statement (41)/(57) revealed that the majority of the respondents *show their students similarities and differences of Czech and English grammar systems during grammar teaching* either 'frequently' (41.9%) or 'occasionally' (45.2%). Not even one respondent reported 'never' using this strategy. As far as the relationships between effectiveness and frequency of the strategy employment are concerned, it was calculated that 38 (41.0%) teachers who reported comparing Czech and English grammar systems 'frequently' and 29 (31.3%) teachers who claimed they do so 'occasionally', value this strategy as '(very) effective'. It is not surprising that all respondents except one (11; 11.9%) who stated to use this strategy 'rarely', evaluate it as 'rather ineffective'. However, it is quite unexpected that 13 (14.0%) who reported using comparison of the two grammar systems think it is 'rather ineffective'.

On the whole, the figures mentioned suggest that teachers tend to believe in the effectiveness of the use of L1 in their grammar lessons. In addition, it could be argued that there is a correlation between the benefits of L1 in grammar teaching and the frequency of its employment during the lessons.

5.3.2 Grammar Teaching Approaches

Several statements inquired about strategies teachers use for grammar presentation and explanation. Statement (37)/(53) asked the respondents how often they *use written explanation of grammar (e.g. writing grammatical features, rules and examples on the board)* and how effective they believe this strategy is for their students. The frequencies showed that more than a half of the respondents (59; 63.4%) say they write rules, examples etc. 'frequently' and almost one third (28; 30.1%) 'occasionally'. The majority (84) of these 87 respondents also reported that this strategy is '(very) effective' in their classes.

The following statement (38)/(54) also revealed quite unequivocal results: most respondents stated that they 'frequently' (88.2%) or 'occasionally' (10.8%) *give their students as many examples of grammar use as possible during grammar teaching* and all of them valued this strategy as '(very) effective'. The next statement (40)/(56) in the category inquired about how often *teachers infer grammatical rules from the example sentences which they*

present to students and how effective they evaluate this strategy. The majority of the teachers again reported a 'frequent' (64; 68.8%) or 'occasional' (26; 28.0%) employment of this strategy and 88 out of these 90 respondents considered this strategy '(very) effective'.

Reactions to statement (43)/(59) showed that the respondents *compare new grammatical features with the grammar students are already familiar with*: 65 (69.9%) respondents reported doing so 'frequently' and 27 (29.0%) 'occasionally'. Most (88) of these 92 respondents then described this strategy as '(very) effective'. The following statement (44)/(60) provoked the respondents' reactions on the whole scale of options though the majority of the teachers stated that they *present grammatical features in complete texts (e.g. a short story)*: 40 (43.0%) 'occasionally' and 34 (36.6%) 'frequently' and 71 of these 74 teachers labelled this strategy as '(very) effective'. In addition, 10 (9.3%) respondents who reported using complete texts for grammar presentation 'rarely' also said they believe this strategy is 'effective'.

Statement (45)/(61) asked the respondents about frequency and effectiveness of the *use of grammar terminology (e.g. the term "past continuous tense") during grammar teaching*. The majority (77; 82.8%) of the respondents said they use the terminology 'frequently' and 61 out of these 77 respondents expressed they believe it is '(very) effective'. The rest (16) of these respondents said that even though they use grammar terminology 'frequently', they perceive this strategy as 'rather ineffective'.

The next statement (46)/(62) which is related to the above-mentioned statement (44)/(60) asked the teachers about the *use of non-adapted authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles) during grammar teaching*. One half (47; 50.5%) of the respondents reported they use them 'rarely'. These teachers then divided into those who think authentic materials are 'effective' (26; 28.0%) and those who believe they are 'rather ineffective' (16; 17.3%). Furthermore, almost one third (30; 32.3%) of the respondents said they employ authentic materials 'occasionally'. Out of these, 24 (25.9%) respondents marked this strategy as 'effective'.

Another statement asked the teachers to rate how often *they make use of students' ability to create hypotheses about grammar which they later prove or disprove* (47)/(63) and how effective they think this strategy is for their students. The most frequent reaction was 'occasionally' (43; 46.2 %), which is supported by 17 (18.3%) 'frequently' responses. The second most frequent reaction was 'rarely' marked by about one quarter (25; 26.9%) of the respondents. As for the perceived effectiveness, the majority (53; 57.2%) of the teachers who

said they use the discussed strategy 'occasionally' or 'frequently' think it is '(very) effective'. Effectiveness of this strategy was seen also by several respondents (9; 9.7%) who claimed to use it 'rarely'. The rest (15; 16.0%) of those who said they use the strategy 'rarely', expressed that they think it is 'rather ineffective'.

The last two statements in this area inquired about coursebooks. Statement (49)/(65) that asked whether and how often teachers *use a coursebook which all students have as the primary material for teaching grammar* indicated that the majority (82; 88.2%) of the respondents do so 'frequently'. In addition, 80 of these respondents value the use of a coursebook for teaching grammar as '(very) effective'. In the second statement, the teachers were asked to rate how often they *present grammatical features in the order they appear in a coursebook* (50)/(66). The results were quite similar to the reactions in the previous statement: 73 (78.5%) respondents reported using this strategy 'frequently' and 18 (19.4%) 'occasionally'. The majority (83) of both these groups of teachers then marked this strategy as '(very) effective'.

Information given by participants in this section indicates that most teachers present grammar explicitly, they make use of teacher-centered ways of grammar presentation on the board and they give their students many examples of grammar use. They also report they use texts for teaching grammar which indicates employment of context. Authentic materials, however, are not used very often in grammar teaching though many teachers claim they believe in their beneficial effects. The majority of the teachers also claimed they present grammar as a system where grammar items are interrelated. Moreover, most teachers also seem to encourage their students to learn grammar inductively when they say they let their students build hypotheses about grammar which are later tested by the students. Many teachers also reported using grammar terminology. As far as coursebooks are concerned, they are reported to be a commonly used grammar-teaching material. Moreover, the majority of the teachers said they follow the order of grammar items presented by coursebooks which reinforces the fact they trust in coursebooks as a suitable teaching material. On the whole, all the strategies mentioned in this section are viewed to be effective by the majority of the participants.

5.3.3 Grammar Practice

The third area of strategies the respondents were asked to give information about was grammar practice. The first statement attempted to discover whether the teachers *employ*

mechanical drill during oral practice of grammatical structures (42)/(58). Almost one third (29; 31.2%) of the respondents stated they use drill 'rarely' but nearly one half (45; 48.4%) of the respondents said they do so 'occasionally' and a few (12; 12.9%) 'frequently'. As for the strategy effectiveness, it was discovered that 44 (47.5%) respondents who reported employing mechanical drill either 'frequently' or 'occasionally' believe in its 'effectiveness'. The majority of those who said they use drill 'rarely' think it is 'rather ineffective' (17; 18.3%).

The second statement (51)/(67) reactions showed that the majority of the respondents *give their students tasks and problem solving situations which urge them to use practised grammar during the practice phase* either 'frequently' (60; 64.5%) or 'occasionally' (28; 30.1%). Nearly all (86) of these teachers also rated this strategy '(very) effective'.

This section revealed that the majority of the participants use mechanical drills at least sometimes during grammar practice. A comparable number of the respondents also claimed they employ meaning-focused grammar activities in their lessons. In addition, these strategies are generally considered to contribute to grammar learning of the respondents' students.

5.3.4 Grammatical Errors

The last set of statements asked the teachers about grammar correction. The first statement inquired about the frequency with which the respondents *encourage students to correct their own errors (39)/(55)* and how effective this strategy seems to be for their students. The majority (78; 83.9%) of the respondents answered that they do so 'frequently' and the rest (15; 16.1%) 'occasionally'. Nearly all of them then stated that this strategy is 'very effective' (46; 49.5%) or 'effective' (43; 46.2%). The second statement *When students have problems during grammar practice, I help them by supportive questions. (48)/64* asked the teachers about grammar correction and grammar practice at the same time. The biggest part of the respondents indicated they use this strategy 'frequently' (63; 67.7%) and almost one third of the teachers stated to do so 'occasionally' (27; 29.0%). This strategy was viewed as '(very) effective' by nearly all (88; 95.0%) of these teachers.

The error section showed that the majority of the participants encourage their students to correct their own grammatical errors. In order to help them arrive at the solution or to figure out their doubts about grammar, the teachers help their students through the use of scaffolding techniques.

Statement:	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Total (% rounded)
(36) I use Czech during grammar teaching (e.g. translation of terms, rules explanation).	2 2.2 %	19 20.4 %	41 44.1 %	31 33.3 %	93 100%
(37) I use written explanation of grammar (e.g. writing grammatical features, rules and examples on the board).	– –	6 6.5 %	28 30.1 %	59 63.4 %	93 100%
(38) I give my students as many examples of grammar use as possible during grammar teaching.	– –	1 1.1 %	10 10.8 %	82 88.2 %	93 100%
(39) I encourage students to correct their own mistakes.	– –	– –	15 16.1 %	78 83.9 %	93 100%
(40) I infer grammatical rules from the example sentences which I present to students.	– –	3 3.2 %	26 28.0 %	64 68.8 %	93 100%
(41) I show my students similarities and differences of Czech and English grammar systems during grammar teaching.	– –	12 12.9 %	42 45.2 %	39 41.9 %	93 100%
(42) I employ mechanical drill during oral practice of grammatical structures.	7 7.5 %	29 31.2 %	45 48.4 %	12 12.9 %	93 100%
(43) I compare new grammatical features with the grammar students are already familiar with.	– –	1 1.1 %	27 29.0 %	65 69.9 %	93 100%
(44) I present grammatical features in complete texts (e.g. a short story).	4 4.3 %	15 16.1 %	40 43.0 %	34 36.6 %	93 100%
(45) I use grammar terminology (e.g. the term “past continuous tense”) during grammar teaching.	– –	2 2.2 %	14 15.1 %	77 82.8 %	93 100%
(46) I use non-adapted authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles) during grammar teaching.	8 8.6 %	47 50.5 %	30 32.3 %	8 8.6 %	93 100%
(47) I make use of students' ability to create hypotheses about grammar which they later prove or disprove.	8 8.6 %	25 26.9 %	43 46.2 %	17 18.3 %	93 100%
(48) When students have problems during grammar practice, I help them by supportive questions.	1 1.1 %	2 2.2 %	27 29.0 %	63 67.7 %	93 100%
(49) The primary material I use for teaching grammar is a coursebook which all students have.	1 1.1 %	2 2.2 %	8 8.6 %	82 88.2 %	93 100%
(50) I present grammatical features in the order they appear in a coursebook.	1 1.1 %	1 1.1 %	18 19.4%	73 78.5%	93 100%

(51) I give my students tasks and problem solving situations which urge them to use practised grammar during the practice phase.	–	5	28	60	93
	–	5.4%	30.1 %	64.5%	100%

Table 7: Frequency of Use of Grammar-Teaching Strategies

Statement:	Very ineffective	Rather ineffective	Effective	Very effective	Total (% rounded)
(52) I use Czech during grammar teaching (e.g. translation of terms, rules explanation).	3 3.2 %	10 10.8%	59 63.4 %	21 22.6 %	93 100%
(53) I use written explanation of grammar (e.g. writing grammatical features, rules and examples on the board).	– –	5 5.4 %	60 64.5 %	28 30.1 %	93 100%
(54) I give my students as many examples of grammar use as possible during grammar teaching.	– –	1 1.1 %	46 49.5 %	46 49.5 %	93 100%
(55) I encourage students to correct their own mistakes.	– –	4 4.3 %	43 46.2 %	46 49.5 %	93 100%
(56) I infer grammatical rules from the example sentences which I present to students.	– –	2 2.2 %	56 60.2 %	35 37.6 %	93 100%
(57) I show my students similarities and differences of Czech and English grammar systems during grammar teaching.	– –	25 26.9%	55 59.1 %	13 14.0 %	93 100%
(58) I employ mechanical drill during oral practice of grammatical structures.	2 2.2 %	28 30.1 %	56 60.2 %	7 7.5 %	93 100%
(59) I compare new grammatical features with the grammar students are already familiar with.	– –	4 4.3 %	64 68.8 %	25 26.9 %	93 100%
(60) I present grammatical features in complete texts (e.g. a short story).	1 1.1 %	9 9.7 %	72 77.4 %	11 11.8 %	93 100%
(61) I use grammar terminology (e.g. the term “past continuous tense”) during grammar teaching.	1 1.1 %	28 30.1 %	54 58.1 %	10 10.8 %	93 100%
(62) I use non-adapted authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles) during grammar teaching.	4 4.3 %	24 25.8 %	58 62.4 %	7 7.5 %	93 100%
(63) I make use of students' ability to create hypotheses about grammar which they later prove or disprove.	4 4.3 %	27 29.0 %	47 50.5 %	15 16.1%	93 100%

(64) When students have problems during grammar practice, I help them by supportive questions.	–	4	70	19	93
	–	4.3 %	75.3 %	20.4%	100%
(65) The primary material I use for teaching grammar is a coursebook which all students have.	1	3	64	25	93
	1.1%	3.2 %	68.8 %	26.9 %	100%
(66) I present grammatical features in the order they appear in a coursebookbook.	–	10	72	11	93
	–	10.8 %	77.4%	11.8 %	100%
(67) I give my students tasks and problem solving situations which urge them to use practised grammar during the practice phase.	2	2	48	41	93
	2.2 %	2.2 %	51.6%	44.1 %	100%

Table 8: Effectivity of Grammar-Teaching Strategies

5.4 Analysis of the Open Questionnaire Item (68)

At the end of the questionnaire, the teachers were asked to think about the concept of 'method'¹. Since the question 'Do you have your own method of teaching English grammar? If you think so, please describe it briefly.' was voluntary, unlike the rest of the questionnaire, the answers were received only from 38 (41.0%) respondents. Some of them described ways of teaching grammar in their lessons including reasons for what they do whilst others provided just several details about their grammar teaching.

This section starts with the analysis of more complex comments that provided a larger amount of information about the teachers' approaches and techniques and concludes with a summary and analysis of the brief comments. The analysis focuses mainly on variables that influence the teachers' decisions in grammar teaching and observed correspondences and dissonances of the teacher's beliefs throughout the questionnaire and the teachers' actual practice as described in reactions to the discussed question.

5.4.1 Teacher 1

Teacher 1 teaches English at a grammar school. He is 68 years old and he has been teaching English for more than 10 years. In 1974 he graduated from the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague where he received a master's degree in English and Swedish (languages for secondary education). Teacher 1 said the way he teaches English grammar was influenced mainly by coursebooks used in his grammar lessons. When he was asked to describe his method of teaching English grammar, he wrote:

Svou "metodu" bych nazval "tradiční". Začnu ze širších souvislostí češtiny i angličtiny, příklady uvedu na tabuli nebo je vyhledáme v textu v učebnici, pak nadiktuji do sešitu pravidla a pár příkladů. Následně uděláme pár cvičení v učebnici a na dané téma je i domácí úkol. Motivačně pro nadanější je možno udělat výklad v angličtině ale míru pochopení daného problému člověk pozná podle toho, jak tomu porozuměl "dvojkař nebo trojkař". Proto je výklad v češtině nutný. Jsem vděčný i za drilování struktur typu "Ask me if I lost it."

Teacher 1 states he likes to compare English and Czech grammar systems and he says he uses Czech as a teaching aid also for grammar explanation since he can be sure of all his students' understanding. Even though he states explanation in English can be motivating for more proficient students, he is aware of the fact there are also less proficient students in his class who can benefit from grammar explanation in their L1. Czech is not thus used randomly during grammar teaching but, on the contrary, its use is well-justified by the teacher.

1 'Method' is understood here as a "practical realisation of an approach [...which includes] types of activities, roles of teachers and learners, the kinds of material which will be helpful, and some model of syllabus organisation" (Harmer, 2001: 78).

As teacher 1 claims above and as he reacted to statement (43)/(59)¹, he likes to deliver new English grammar also in the context of English that students are already familiar with. It can be thus assumed he presents English grammar as a holistic system where grammar items are related. He describes his method as “traditional” which appears to stand for a relatively teacher-fronted instruction approach: “*I start from a broader context of Czech and English, I present examples on the board or we [I and students] look them up in a text in a coursebook, I dictate rules and examples which students write in their notebooks.*” Teacher 1 mentioned in the questionnaire that he likes to employ both inductive and deductive learning of grammar in his classes². Therefore, we can guess that he sometimes lets students discover grammar rules and we can regard the description of 'his method' as a favourite or a more usual model of the way he teaches grammar.

As far as practice activities are concerned, teacher 1 states “we do several exercises in a coursebook”. We can assume that grammar practice is directed by the coursebook which teacher 1 uses as the main teaching material during grammar teaching³. If we consider the fact coursebooks shaped his way of grammar teaching mentioned above, we can say that this teacher's grammar instruction is both teacher- and coursebook-centered. Teacher 1 further mentions that he likes to employ drill practice exercises of structures such as 'Ask me if I lost it.'⁴ According to teacher 1's reactions to statements in the questionnaire, we can say he is generally in favour of drill exercises which he believes are effective⁵.

5.4.2 Teacher 2

Teacher 2 teaches English at a grammar school. She is 32 years old and she has more than 10 years of experience teaching English. She studies teaching of social sciences and theoretical pedagogy at the Faculty of Education, Charles University in Prague. She does not mention any university studies of English, her highest attained level of education reported is her high school diploma she received in 2001. She said the way she teaches grammar was

-
- 1 Teacher 1 stated that he FREQUENTLY compares new grammatical features with grammar students are already familiar with (43) and he reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE for his students (59).
 - 2 Teacher 1 stated that he teaches grammar both ways A (I first present a grammatical feature and rules to my students and then I give them examples of the usage.) and B (I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples.) (34).
 - 3 Teacher 1 stated that he FREQUENTLY uses a coursebook which all students have as the primary material for teaching grammar (49) and he reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE for his students (65).
 - 4 This type of drill exercise is based on teacher-student/student-student interaction. The teacher/a student gives an indirect question to another student whose task is to rephrase it and produce a question which is answered by someone in the class.
 - 5 Teacher 1 stated that he OCCASIONALLY employs mechanical drill during oral practice of grammatical structures (42) and he reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE for his students (58). Moreover, he agreed with the statement 'practice through mechanical drill is useful for teaching and learning the language' (18).

influenced mainly by her English teacher at school, student's books she has used in her English lessons and her experience with teaching students. Her reaction to the question that asked her to describe her method of teaching English grammar was:

Kombinuji několik postupů popsaných výše. Nejprve se snažím, aby studenti na základě vzorových vět odvodili pravidla sami, poté následuje ucelený výklad (obvykle v češtině, abych měla jistotu, že skutečně všichni přesně porozuměli), a pak procvičování mnoha způsoby (obvykle už v angličtině) - doplňovačky, překladové věty, krátké rozhovory, ústně kladené otázky, a nadále dlouhodobě upozorňuji na zajímavé gramatické jevy v jakýchkoliv materiálech (videu, textech), se kterými pracujeme. Těžko se mi ale zobecňuje, gramatiku celkem zřejmě učím jinak u primánů na úrovni A1 (jednoduché gramatické struktury, více češtiny, žádné odborné termíny, drill spíše než vysvětlování) a v semináři na vyšším gymnáziu na C1 (složitě struktury, které je nutno pochopit, nestačí jen nadřilovat, méně češtiny) a v soukromých hodinách s dospělými (jen úplně nejnutnější gramatika, hlavně že mluví...)

Teacher 2 mentions she combines several approaches described in the questionnaire which suggests she recognized approaches which were not explicitly named in the statements throughout the questionnaire form. Even though she describes her grammar presentation as a discovery technique which encourages students to derive rules from example sentences followed by grammar explanation, she mentioned in the questionnaire that she likes to employ both deductive and inductive way of learning grammar¹. We can thus assume both ways are applied in her lessons. Besides grammar instruction in separate activities, teacher 2 claims she teaches grammar incidentally: she points out interesting grammar items in materials such as texts and videos which the class works with.

She also mentions she usually explains grammar in Czech because she wants to make sure everybody in the class understands. If we consider also her reactions in the questionnaire,² we can conclude that teacher 2 uses Czech since she believes it is effective for her students' learning. We can also notice that she says she uses less Czech with advanced students compared to beginners. Her reflection suggests that the teacher is aware of appropriateness and necessity of using Czech in English grammar lessons. In addition, we can notice that Czech is sometimes used even during the practice phase: teacher 2 uses translation of sentences which corresponds with the reported employment of comparison of Czech and English grammar systems in her lessons³.

1 Teacher 2 stated that he teaches grammar both ways A (I first present a grammatical feature and rules to my students and then I give them examples of the usage.) and B (I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples.) (34).

2 Teacher 2 stated that she OFTEN (36) uses Czech during grammar teaching (e.g. translation of terms, rules explanation) and she reports this technique is VERY EFFECTIVE (52).

3 Teacher 2 stated that she FREQUENTLY shows her students similarities and differences of Czech and English grammar systems during grammar teaching (41) and she reports this technique is EFFECTIVE (57).

Teacher 2 further claims she employs a wide range of activities during grammar practice: gap-filling exercises, translation of sentences, short conversations and seeking answers to oral questions. Moreover, she mentioned in the questionnaire that she sometimes practises grammar through solving tasks and problem situations.¹ Therefore, her students seem to get chance to practise grammar in both controlled-practice exercises and free-production activities.

At the end, teacher 2 mentions the way she teaches grammar varies depending on her learners' proficiency, e.g. she uses no terminology but she employs drills rather than explanation with beginners. This procedure is not exceptional since behavioural drills have been traditionally considered suitable for lower-level students before acquisition of grammar basics essential for communication in the language². Teacher 2 further states that drills are not sufficient for teaching advanced grammar since higher-level students must not only know how to use the structures but they should also understand them. Teacher 2 implies here that students should also know grammar theory which she mentioned in the questionnaire,³ too. Finally, we can say that teacher 2 reflects her students' needs and their learning goals when she mentions she teaches grammar a different way and to a different extent with distinct groups of students (e.g. high-schools students compared to adult students in her private classes).

5.4.3 Teacher 3

Teacher 3 has more than 10 years of English-teaching experience. She currently teaches English both at a grammar school and a secondary school where she teaches children 11-15 years old. She graduated in 1979 from the Faculty of Trade, the University of Economics in Prague which qualifies her to teach English and Economics. She reported the way she teaches English grammar was influenced mainly by the way she was taught by her English teacher/s, the use of a teacher's book, participation in seminars and courses organised by the British Council, the USIA⁴, the Association of English Teachers and other courses

1 Teacher 2 stated that she OCCASIONALLY gives her students tasks and problem solving situations which urge them to use practised grammar during the practice phase. (51) and she reports this technique is EFFECTIVE (67).

2 See section 2.4.8.

3 Teacher 2 AGREED with the statement 'students' knowledge of English should include, among others, theoretical knowledge of the grammar system and the way it works' (4).

4 "United States Information Agency was an independent foreign affairs agency supporting U.S. foreign policy and national interests abroad. USIA conducted international educational and cultural exchanges, broadcasting, and information programs in 1953-1999." <<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/>>

abroad, among others also participation in the programmes Phare¹ and Comenius². Even though teacher 3 studied neither linguistics nor pedagogy, she has a lot of experience from voluntary programmes and courses for English teachers.

When she was asked to describe her method of teaching English grammar, teacher 3 replied:

Od funkce, t.j. od užití, postupuji k odvození pravidel, ve spolupráci se studenty. Podstatné je, podle mého názoru, aby si spojili situace s gramatikou, ne aby se nadřeli gramatiku a pak zjišťovali, kdy se vlastně používá. Lidé nějak mluví a píší, gramatika to jen popisuje a systematizuje. Neučím budoucí lingvisty, ale uživatele jazyka, proto uvažuji o praktickém využití toho, co své žáky učím. Snažím se, aby gramatiku vnímali jako součást celku, ne jako něco odděleného od živoucího a vyvíjejícího se organismu, jakým angličtina je. Užívám anglickou terminologii a učím ji studenty, aby byli schopni se učit a zdokonalovat pomocí materiálů v angličtině (English Grammar in Use a podobně), aby byli samostatní. Snažím se podávat angličtinu pomocí angličtiny, protože čeština je samostatná struktura, jejíž použití může někdy i zdržovat a komplikovat vnímání angličtiny. Ne vše, zejména na vyšší úrovni jazyka, má odpovídající ekvivalent. Snažím se používat dostatek autentických materiálů a učit žáky hledat souvislosti a odvozovat - například Pres. Perfect, Past Perfect, Future Perfect. Snažím se také, aby výuka byla zaměřena na různé typy žáků (Auditory, Visual, Kinesthetic...), tak používám i schémata, i příklady používající pohybu (Past Simple a Continuous), v případě, že to je možné, pro "suchary" i české příklady. Mám v oblibě klíčové fráze nebo krátké akce, které si mohou představit a zapamatovat, jako věšáčky, na nichž mají jev uložený v paměti, kdyby po čase zapomněli.

At the beginning, we can see that teacher 3 advocates the functional view of language where grammar is viewed as a vehicle for people to express themselves in communication. She perceives her students as users of language and not future linguists. This approach is probably great for most students but it can be demotivating for students who might be interested in university studies of philology and linguistics. However, in order to judge possible disadvantages of this approach, we would have to know the philosophy and the overall subject orientation of the grammar school teacher 3 works at.

Furthermore, teacher 3 wants that her students understand grammar as a functional part of the language and she stated she teaches grammar implicitly which she mentioned in the questionnaire³, too. She involves her students in the process and she aims for her students to learn grammar in the context⁴ of situations when grammar is used which is very close to the

1 "The **Phare** programme was a pre-accession programme financed by the [European Union](#) to assist the applicant countries of [Central and Eastern Europe](#) in their preparations for joining the European Union." <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52003DC0497>>.

2 "The Comenius sub-programme focused on all levels of school education [...and] it was designed [among others] to encourage language learning, ICT for education, and better teaching techniques, enhance the quality and European dimension of teacher training [and] improve approaches to teaching and school management." <http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/llp_en.htm>.

3 Teacher 3 stated that he teaches grammar implicitly (B): I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples. (34)

4 Teacher 3 reported practice of grammatical features must always take place within a context given by a

philosophy of grammaring¹. In addition, she claimed both in her method description and the questionnaire² that she uses a lot of authentic materials that are effective to the extent that practised grammar within the materials does not cause problems to the students³.

Teacher 3 further spoke about developing her students' autonomy which she supported by the use of grammar terminology⁴ that is necessary for her students' self-study with English grammar practice books. Her students are encouraged to look for relations and make conclusions⁵ which teacher 3 tries to make easier for all of her students. Therefore, she works with students' different learning styles and she employs visual schemes, examples including movement etc. accordingly. If she thinks it can be helpful for some students' learning, she uses Czech even though she usually teaches English by English. She believes both Czech and English are independent systems which cannot always be compared and contrasted. Teacher 3 even claims that the use of Czech can sometimes complicate and slow down teaching English grammar⁶.

It is well-noticeable that teacher 3 considers her students' characteristics and instead of teaching grammar, she teaches students. She admits that students can forget grammar they had been taught which she seems to regard a natural part of the learning process. She, as a teacher, reported giving her students key phrases and 'short actions' which can help the students remember grammatical features in case they hesitate.

5.4.4 Teacher 4

Teacher 4 teaches English and German at a high school. She is 39 years old and has taught English for more than 10 years. She received her master's degree from the Faculty of Arts, University of Ostrava in 1999. She said the way she teaches English grammar was influenced especially by her experience teaching students, student's books used in her lessons

communication situation (17).

1 See section 3.6.

2 Teacher 3 reported she FREQUENTLY uses non-adapted authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles) during grammar teaching (46) and she reported this technique is EFFECTIVE (62).

3 Teacher 3 reported her students do NOT have problems with already practised grammatical features included in authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles)(31).

4 Teacher 3 reported she FREQUENTLY uses grammar terminology (e.g. the term "past continuous tense") during grammar teaching (45) and she reported this technique is VERY EFFECTIVE (61). Moreover, teacher 3 reported her students use grammar terminology during English lessons (e.g. the term "past participle") (30).

5 Teacher 3 reported she FREQUENTLY makes use of students' ability to create hypotheses about grammar which they later prove or disprove (47) and she reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (63).

6 Teacher 3 reported she OCCASIONALLY uses Czech during grammar teaching (e.g. translation of terms, rules explanation) (36) and she reported this technique is RATHER INEFFECTIVE (52). Moreover, teacher 3 reported she OCCASIONALLY shows her students similarities and differences of Czech and English grammar systems during grammar teaching (41) and she reported this strategy is RATHER INEFFECTIVE (57).

and teaching methodology books. Teacher 4 described her method of teaching English grammar as follows:

Rozhodně učím explicitně a u vysvětlování se snažím využívat induktivní metodu. Deduktivní zřídka, spíše pokud si jev připomínáme a v tom případě se žáků na pravidla/formu ptám. Občas používám peer teaching, hlavně v hodně heterogenních skupinách. U procvičování hodně používám komunikativní drily a mingle activities. Snažím se o rovnováhu psaného a ústního procvičování a o postup k free activities. U testování testuji obvykle v krátkém samostatném testu formu a použití v samostatných větách. V komplexnějším testu jsou pak také komunikativní úlohy a testování prostřednictvím jazykových dovedností.

At the very beginning, teacher 4 claims she teaches grammar explicitly and she tries to employ inductive learning. The deductive design is rarely used, mostly during revision in which case it is not the teacher but students who pronounce grammar rules.¹ We can assume teacher 4 tries to engage her students in the process of grammar teaching when she mentions she sometimes uses peer teaching especially in heterogeneous groups.

The teacher mentions she tries to balance written and oral practice exercises and she also focuses on free production activities. Grammar practice in teacher 4's lessons is reported to include communicative drills, which she mentioned also in the questionnaire², and mingle activities that show again that the teacher is moved to the background and students are encouraged to interact among each other. In addition, teacher 4 describes the way she tests her students' grammar knowledge. Firstly, she employs individual sentences to test both the form and the use of grammar, however, she does not mention whether the exercise has a form of translation of sentences between Czech and English or whether the students fill in gaps in the sentences. Secondly, more complex tests include also communicative activities and exercises which test grammar indirectly through other language skills.

5.4.5 Teacher 5

Teacher 5 teaches English both at a grammar school and in university courses. He is 45 years old and he has more than ten years of experience teaching English. He completed his master's degree in secondary-school teaching in 2009 at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague. He reported that the way he teaches English grammar was influenced mainly by teaching methodology books, his experience with teaching students and his desire to be happy about his work and his students' results. When asked to describe his method of

1 Teacher 4 stated that she teaches grammar both ways A (I first present a grammatical feature and rules to my students and then I give them examples of the usage.) and B (I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples.) (34).

2 Teacher 4 commented on the statement 'Practice through mechanical drill is useful for teaching and learning the language.' (18): yes, if we speak about communicative drill.

teaching English grammar, he answered:

Vždy zohledňuji úroveň studentů, a to jak jazykovou, tak intelektuální a jejich potřeby. Ne každý chce mluvit správně, někomu stačí se vyjádřit třeba i s chybami. I to je OK. S gramatikou pracuji aktivně, poukazuji na jevy, které se vyskytují v textech, s nimiž pracujeme, často se ptám na to, jak věci fungují a proč. Vedu studenty k tomu, aby si vytvářeli vlastní koncepci gramatiky, jen je vedu směrem, který považuji za správný. Často procvičuji, ale spíše krátce. Zapojuji kontext, snažím se o maximální využití času.

This rather short description shows that teacher 5 alters grammar instruction according to his students – their proficiency and their language goals. He said he respects that some students are happy when they are able to communicate in the language even though their English is not grammatically perfect¹. He wants his students to develop their own concept of grammar system which he believes is beneficial for students². He directs this process and he helps them form the grammar system in a way he believes is the right one. The teacher says he teaches grammar incidentally: he draws students' attention to grammatical features that appear in texts³ the class works with. He wants his students to understand how and why grammar works⁴ and, therefore, these questions are often considered and discussed in the class. Teacher 5 tries to make a maximal use of the time given in the lessons which is reflected in the way grammar is practised: he says that although grammar is practised shortly, he does so frequently⁵ and in context⁶.

5.4.6 Teacher 6

Teacher 6 teaches English and chemistry at a grammar school. She is 35 years old and she has been teaching English for more than 10 years. She has not received pedagogically-specialized education, she completed her master's programme at the Institute of Chemical Technology in Prague in 1999. She stated that the way she teaches English grammar was influenced mainly by her English teacher(s) and her own teaching experience. She gave the

1 Teacher 5 AGREED with the statement 'it is not necessary for students to express themselves in grammatically correct sentences if they are able to express what they desire' (23).

2 Teacher 5 STRONGLY AGREED with the statement 'theoretical knowledge of the grammar system gives my students feeling of security' (32).

3 Teacher 5 stated that he FREQUENTLY presents grammatical features in complete texts (e.g. a short story) (44) and he reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (60).

4 Teacher 5 AGREED with the statement 'students' knowledge of English should include, among others, theoretical knowledge of the grammar system and the way it works' (4).

5 Teacher 5 AGREED with the statements 'the practice of grammatical features should be the main part of teaching grammar' (13) and 'regular/frequent practice of grammatical features contributes significantly to students' ability to use grammar correctly and precisely' (16).

6 Teacher 5 AGREED with the statement 'practice of grammatical features must always take place within a context given by a communication situation' (17).

following description of her grammar-teaching method:

Samostatná pečlivá práce studentů doma podle svého plánu učebnice Murphy a samostatná kontrola podle klíče a označení svých chyb. V hodinách pak procvičení a prozkoušení a práce s texty např. nebo slovní situace. Sokratova metoda kladení otázek ať už učitele či studenta a hledání odpovědí na ně. Vede k lepšímu zapamatování a pochopení daného jevu.

Even though teacher 6 described her method quite briefly, we can see that she leaves a considerable portion of learning grammar up to students who use 'Murphy's textbook'¹ that allows them to study without the teacher's assistance and to check controlled-practice grammar exercises with the key. Teacher 6 mentions students mark their errors they make in these exercises, however, she does not state how these errors are corrected, whether the errors are discussed in the class and corrected either by the teacher or other students. According to the teacher's reactions in the questionnaire, we can just assume that teacher 6 encourages students to self-correct².

Home preparation is supplemented by in-lesson practice that comprises, for instance, text-based activities which, according to teacher 6's information received in the questionnaire, include authentic texts, too³. Moreover, teacher 6 employs 'verbal situations'⁴ which represent free-production activities. The teacher also states she uses the method of Socratic questioning where the teacher and students ask questions and search answers to them. The teacher says she believes this method helps students remember and understand grammatical features. Despite the fact teacher 6 does not state which types of Socratic questions⁵ and in which grammar-learning phases they are employed, we can say that she tries to involve her students and to encourage them to take an active role in the learning process. In addition, we can assume from the information in the questionnaire that teacher 6 uses supportive questions as a reaction to her students' problems during grammar practice⁶.

1 English Grammar in Use - a self-study reference and practice book for intermediate – upper-intermediate students that was written by Raymond Murphy and published by Cambridge University Press.
<<http://www.cambridge.org/us/cambridgeenglish/catalog/grammar-vocabulary-and-pronunciation/english-grammar-use-4th-edition>>

2 Teacher 6 stated she FREQUENTLY encourages students to correct their own mistakes (39) and she reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (55).

3 Teacher 6 stated she FREQUENTLY uses non-adapted authentic materials (e.g. newspaper articles) during grammar teaching (46) and she reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (62).

4 Verbal situations are understood as problem solving situations which teacher 6 reported to employ frequently; she stated she FREQUENTLY gives her students tasks and problem solving situations which urge them to use practised grammar during the practice phase (51) and she reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (67).

5 Generally, there are six types of Socratic questions, e.g. questions for clarification, questions that probe implications and consequences. For more information, see
<<http://www.umich.edu/~elements/probsolv/strategy/cthinking.htm>>.

6 Teacher 6 stated she FREQUENTLY helps her students by supportive questions when they have problems during grammar practice (55) and she reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (64).

5.4.7 Teacher 7

Teacher 7 is 37 years old and she has between 5 and 10 years of English teaching experience. She received her master's degree in Teaching English Language and Literature from Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno in 2014. She currently teaches English at a grammar school and a high school. She mentioned the way she teaches English grammar was influenced mainly by the way she was taught English grammar by her teacher(s), her own teaching experience, language teaching methodology seminars she attended during her studies and the use of a teacher's book. She described her grammar teaching methodology as follows:

Snažím se gramatiku představovat jako součást jazyka, která studentům pomůže vyjádřit se přesně a používat ji se studenty přímo v komunikačních situacích. Složitější jevy se snažím představit jako fráze, které se dají nadřilovat a později obměnit pro použití v jiných situacích.

This brief description shows that teacher 7 adheres to the functional view of the language or, at least, she presents grammar as a part of the language that helps students express themselves in communication situations. In the questionnaire, teacher 7 expressed that theoretical knowledge of grammar system is not necessary unless we speak about a grammar school student who would like to study English at university¹. Teacher 7 says she presents more complex grammatical structures as phrases that are later modified for the use in different situations, which she mentioned also in the questionnaire². The phrases can be learnt by drills that are reported by the teacher as an effective strategy in grammar teaching³.

5.4.8 Teacher 8

Teacher 8 is 45 years old and she has more than ten years of English teaching experience. She completed her master's programme in English and Czech language teaching methodology in 1993 at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague. She currently teaches English at a grammar school and in university seminars. Teacher 8 stated the way she teaches English grammar was influenced by the way she was taught English by her teacher/s, her experience with teaching students, student's books and teacher's books used in her English lessons and language teaching methodology books. When asked to describe her English grammar teaching method, she wrote:

1 Teacher 7's reaction to statement (4).

2 Teacher 7 stated she strives that her students learn grammatical features as fixed or semi-fixed expressions and phrases which they later use to infer rules of their formation and usage.

3 Teacher 7 AGREED with the statement 'practice through mechanical drill is useful for teaching and learning the language' (18).

Vysvětlují vždy dvě strany gramatického jevu: tzv. stavební stránku, tj. tvoření, součásti tvaru atd., a tady je na místě mechanické drilové procvičování. U tzv. významové stránky vysvětlují použití jevu, dávám příklady, různý kontext, studenti sami musí tvořit věty s daným jevem, opravuji případně chyby a chci, aby např. u časů uměli přesně identifikovat a pojmenovat děj, který se daným časem vyjadřuje.

Teacher 8 describes two sides of grammatical features she presents to her students explicitly: form and function. Each of them is then practised differently. The form of a structure is practised by mechanical drills which were reported as effective by the teacher¹. The meaning and use of grammar are supported by examples in different contexts. During practising, students create their own sentences² which contain the discussed grammar and they are sometimes asked to describe information and situation which are expressed by the grammatical structure. Errors are corrected by the teacher and, as teacher 8 mentioned in the questionnaire, students are encouraged to self-correct³, too.

Remaining descriptions of teachers' English grammar teaching methods were put into several groups according to shared theme.

5.4.9 Eclecticism and Combination of Methods

Four respondents described their grammar teaching method as 'eclectic' (teacher 9), 'a combination of all methods available' (teacher 10), 'changing methods' (teacher 11) and 'a bit of everything' (teacher 12) (their original full responses are presented in Table...). We can see that the most important factor in teachers' decision and selection of a method or methods is the particular aspect of grammar they teach. In addition, teachers 10 and 12 seem to think about advantages and disadvantages of individual methods in relation to grammar. When participants state they simply combine or alternate methods, they probably refer to methods as labels for sets of strategies and techniques they employ during teaching grammar in their English classes. Only teacher 9 said his eclectic method is based on testing methods, reflection of his own teaching and methodological support. We can thus assume that this teacher is critical of the way he employs methods and that he searches for an alternative to a

1 Teacher 8 STRONGLY AGREED with the statement 'practice through mechanical drill is useful for teaching and learning the language' (18). Moreover, she stated she FREQUENTLY employs mechanical drill during oral practice of grammatical structures (42) and she reported this strategy is EFFECTIVE (58).

2 Teacher 8 AGREED with the statement 'grammar practice through individual sentences is useful for grammar teaching' (14).

3 Teacher 8 stated she FREQUENTLY encourages students to correct their own mistakes (39) and she reported this strategy is VERY EFFECTIVE (55).

method that would satisfy his and his students' needs and preferences. The other teachers (10, 11 and 12) do not mention any criteria besides grammar discussed which can indicate they do not have any other criteria and that they use mainly their intuition for selection of methods. Nevertheless, this hypothesis would have to be confirmed by more details about their actual grammar teaching.

Teacher 9	Eklektickou, získanou kombinací z praxe, zkušenostmi, přípravami a hodnocením průběhu hodiny a dosažení výukových cílů a záměrů v plánu hodiny, dalším vzděláváním samostatnou četbou metodických materiálů a účasti na seminářích.
Teacher 10	Kombinace všech dostupných metod je účinná. Je nutné pouze zvolit, při jakém gramatickém jevu tomu tak je. Ne všechny metody se hodí na výuku určitých jevů.
Teacher 11	Snažím se o střídání metod podle dané hodiny. Uplatňuji jak tradiční a konzervativní grammar-translation method, tak direct, communicative aj.
Teacher 12	Od všeho trochu - jisté jevy je lepší vysvětlovat jednou metodou a jiné zas jinou.

Table 9: Eclecticism and Combination of Methods

5.4.10 Students' Needs

Six participants reported that they do not have one method of grammar teaching that would be applied in their grammar lessons since the way they teach grammar is influenced by students they teach. We can see that the teaching process is not directed primarily by a method but that their student's variables (characteristics, needs, type of school) enter the decision-making process which results in adaptation of one or more language-teaching methods to the benefit of students. In addition, it can be observed that one method may not be sufficient for some teachers (e.g. teacher 18 who favours a combination of game-based techniques) or that the concept of 'approach' is even preferred to the concept of 'method' which seems to be dismissed as useless (teacher 15).

Teacher 13	Metoda vždy záleží na úrovni a oboru studenta: obchodní akademie jinak než gymnázium a jinak než víceleté gymnázium.
Teacher 14	Metody spíše kombinuji, především se ale snažím přizpůsobit styl, metody, rychlost výuky i skladbu hodin potřebám dané třídy.
Teacher 15	Místo pojmu metoda bych radši použil slovo přístup. Nejúčinnější považuji přístup, kdy žák a učitel si rozumí a mají chuť spolu něco vytvářet. Nejlépe se mi osvědčilo, vycházet z daného okamžiku, reagovat na podněty a vyhledávat materiály a cvičení, který mají přímou souvislost s danými lidmi v danou chvíli. Je podstatné mít prostor pro improvizaci a společné tvoření.
Teacher 16	Ne, na každou skupinu studentů platí něco jiného - někteří nepotřebují výklad v češtině, někteří chtějí mít vše v tabulkách apod.
Teacher 17	To je spíše intuitivní, vytušit z reakcí studentů, jak je nejlepší daný jev procvičovat, eventuálně znovu vyložit.

Teacher 18	Používat jednu metodu nevidím jako účinnou. Vždy jde o jedinečnou skupinu žáků a od toho se odvíjí metody. Stejně tak jedna metoda nestačí, musí být kombinace, výběr, dle potřeby skupiny. Jako účinné se mi jeví metody spojené s hrou (např. při procvičení minulého času začnu první větu příběhu/pohádky a každý žák přidá další větu k příběhu, který se musí odehrávat v minulosti. Používám taky názorné pomůcky, kreslím, předvádím/žáci předvádí.
------------	---

Table 10: Students' Needs

5.4.11 PPP

Seven respondents described their method as a pattern composed of several phases that follow the model PPP¹. In general, all these teachers claim they first present grammar and they usually do so in a situational context (e.g. sentence, text, picture, recording). Presentation is followed by identification and description of the form, the situation/s of the grammar use and sometimes the communicative aim of the grammar use. Whether teachers prefer either deductive or inductive instruction was mentioned only by teacher 24 who says he lets students infer meaning and function which he stated in the questionnaire, too². According to information provided in the questionnaire, we can assume the other respondents start teaching grammar sometimes inductively and sometimes deductively³. We can also notice that teachers explain, summarize and give students rules and exceptions. In the second phase, students are engaged in controlled-practice exercises that are usually based on drills, gap-fills, translation of sentences etc. The third phase enables students to practise grammar indirectly through written and spoken production of language.

Teacher 19	Jedna stoprocentní metoda neexistuje, ale ctím zásadu 3E.
Teacher 20	Krátký text - vyvození gramatiky z textu, zápis příkladových vět, zápis výjimek, procvičování drilem ve větách, poslechem, v rozhovoru (pair work) psaním textu, doplňování cvičení v učebnici.
Teacher 21	příkladem představit (věta, krátký text, poslech) - stručně vysvětlit - procvičit na různých dalších příkladech - zacvičit pomocí drillových cvičení - začít používat při Speaking a Writing
Teacher 22	uvedení příkladu v kontextu-odvození forem-odvození situací, kdy se jev používá-procvičování doplňováním, drill-volná tvorba-úkol-zopakování-test

¹ See section 2.4.11.

² Teacher 24 DISAGREED with the statement 'teachers should start grammar teaching by a theoretical explanation of a new grammar structure' (11) and reacted to the statement 'teachers' main task during grammar teaching is NOT explanation of grammar rules and exceptions' (9) by a comment that 'a teacher should help students infer grammar rules which should be summarized by the teacher'.

³ Teacher 19, 21, 22, 25 stated they teach grammar both ways A (I first present a grammatical feature and rules to my students and then I give them examples of the usage.) and B (I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples.) and teacher 20, 23 stated they teach grammar the way B (I first give examples of grammar usage to my students and then I ask them to discover grammatical rules from the given examples.) (34)

Teacher 23	<p>Ve stručnosti:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. věta v angličtině jako příklad 2. rozpoznání gramatických struktur v uvedené větě 3. rozpoznání komunikační situace a cíle sdělení v uvedené větě 4. zobecnění pravidel, výklad, usouvztažnění s již probranými a známými jevy (je-li na místě) 5. procvičení (překlady vět, opravy chyb atd.) na jednodušší úrovni 6. problematické jevy, výjimky, záludné otázky, rozšíření 7. procvičení včetně složitějších případů, výjimek atd. 8. upozornění na zdroje pro další procvičení (odkaz na cvičení v jiných knihách s klíčem - Murphy apod.)
Teacher 24	vycházet z modelové situace, textu, obrázků apod., které obsahují určitý gramatický jev nebo s ním nějak souvisí; nechat studenty vyvodit význam, funkci určitého jevu a na základě textu přijít na způsob tvoření, učitel pomáhá, vede, koriguje a shrnuje a předkládá různé situace, při kterých studenti mohou danou gramatiku vyzkoušet v kontextu
Teacher 25	Výklad, příklad, drill, samostatná produkce

Table 11: PPP

5.4.12 Other Descriptions

The rest of respondents described various principles and techniques they employ in their grammar lessons. Three teachers stated they use Czech either during grammar presentation (teachers 36 and 37) or practice (teacher 30: translation from Czech to English). Teacher 38 mentioned her experience tells her that students have gaps in their knowledge of the Czech grammar system and an analogy of L1 and L2 thus seems to be ineffective. Therefore, she believes that it is important to create an English grammar system which is acquired by students and continuously expanded.

Several teachers mentioned they involve their students actively in the learning process. Teacher 35 mentioned peer teaching, teacher 27 emphasized students' independence, their own contribution in the lessons, and involving them in guided discoveries as well as it was mentioned by teachers 26 and 28. Teacher 32 suggested a type of group mingle activity, teacher 34 mentioned funny sentences and teacher 36 said she likes using songs for grammar practice. What all these strategies have in common is engagement of students in the grammar-learning process and increasing their motivation. Finally, teacher 33 noticed he believes it is important to give the same importance to grammar and the development of other skills and teacher 29 said he benefits from a teacher's book.

Teacher 26	Hlásím se k expozici gramatického jevu v ukázce (text, audio,...) a pak jejímu rozboru pomocí úkolů, které umožní studentům samostatně formulovat pravidlo.
Teacher 27	Komunikativnost, loudění, nezávislost studenta, vlastní příspěvky studentů, rituály, personalizované aktivity, guided discovery

Teacher 28	Nabídnou studentům několik vět s určitým gramatickým jevem a pomocí návodných otázek jim ukáží formu a využití daného jevu.
Teacher 29	Osvědčilo se mi používat materiály od Oxford University Press - metodika v teacher's booku mi velmi pomáhá a zdá se velmi účinná :-)
Teacher 30	používat často metodu překladu z čj do aj
Teacher 31	procvičovat a procvičovat
Teacher 32	Skládková metoda: studenti pracují ve skupinkách - každá na jiném problému (A-A-A, B-B-B, C-C-C. Potom se promíchají tak, že v nových skupinkách je vždy 1 student z původní skupinky (A-B-C, A-B-C, A-B-C) a sdělují si, k čemu došli. Nakonec se vrátí zpět do původních skupinek - feedback. Dá se použít při studiu gramatiky, vyprávění příběhu, přípravě na writing - téměř na cokoliv. Velmi účinné.
Teacher 33	Vše je nutno dělat ROVNOMĚRNĚ - gramatiku, konverzaci, poslech, psaní, reakce na aktuální dění, atd...
Teacher 34	Vtipné věty
Teacher 35	Studenti si mezi sebou vysvětlují gramatické pojmy a bystřejší často pomáhají slabším žákům.
Teacher 36	Využití analogií s mateřštinou, využití písniček pro procvičení a upevnění různých gramatických jevů
Teacher 37	vyvozování pravidel z předchozích znalostí, z češtiny, textů. pravidla dáváme dohromady společně
Teacher 38	Vzhledem ke skutečnosti, že studenti neznají řadu základních gramatických pravidel v češtině (ano, i v nejvyšších ročnících!), je nutné vytvořit základní gramatický systém v angličtině a tento systém průběžně doplňovat. Je např. docela zábavné vykládat studentům, že Present Perfect je v podstatě české dokonavé sloveso v přítomném čase a následně zjistit, že studenti nedokáží rozlišit česká dokonavá a nedokonavá slovesa.

Table 12: Other Descriptions

The majority of teachers who described their teaching methods have more than ten years of teaching experience¹. As they stated, their teaching was influenced mainly by their own experience with teaching students² which corresponds with the fact the teachers reportedly adapt the whole process of grammar teaching to their students' needs and preferences. Another very influential factor for the teachers was their own English teachers who taught the respondents when they were students³. Further, a number of participants reported the way they teach English grammar is based on coursebooks⁴ and teacher's books⁵. This information indicates that the teachers benefit mainly from their experience both as students and teachers and teaching materials they have at their disposal. More than one half of

1 Out of 38 teachers, 29 teachers have more than 10 years, 7 teachers have 5-10 years and 5 teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience.

2 35 out of 38 teachers

3 23 out of 38 teachers

4 24 out of 38 teachers

5 20 out of 38 teachers

the participants in this section valued also their self-education including reading methodology books, watching methodology videos etc.¹ as an influential factor for their grammar-teaching method. To a lesser extent, some teachers benefit from what they learnt during their studies (e.g. in seminars at universities)² and only a few teachers perceive methodological and material support of schools they work at³ had an effect on the way they teach grammar.

5.4.13 Summary

To sum up, we observed that information and inferences from questionnaire data generally respond to the participants' descriptions of their grammar teaching methods. Firstly, we could notice that the teachers think about the way they teach grammar in relation to their students. The respondents are sensitive to their students' needs and learning goals which obviously correspond to the type of a school where the teachers work. In addition, students' differences within a class or a group such as learning styles or language proficiency are perceived and taken into consideration during the process of planning grammar teaching. The teachers do not seem to regard these and other learner variables as obstacles, on the contrary, they claim they try to adapt their grammar teaching to their students, e.g. they incorporate learning aids according to their students' preferred learning styles and they use peer teaching in proficiency heterogeneous groups.

The fact the teachers respect their students in grammar teaching is reflected also in the use of L1: even if the teachers do not believe L1 should be used in English lessons, they switch to Czech if it proves to be beneficial for their students' better understanding and subsequent faster and more effective learning. The teachers also seem to encourage their students in self-correction and developing their learning autonomy which are supported by activities and tasks students are involved in. The model of teaching supported by the majority of the respondents is based on, besides others, predominating inductive instructional design which is sometimes alternated with deductive instruction. Some teachers also mentioned they teach grammar incidentally during activities primarily focused on developing other skills such as reading or listening.

Grammar instruction generally comprises focus on both grammar form and function. Examples are often given in a context of sentences or texts. The whole process includes giving students grammar rules of formation and usage which are often inferred by learners

1 20 out of 38 teachers
2 16 out of 38 teachers
3 8 out of 38 teachers

during discovery activities and later summarized by the teacher. Grammar practice includes both controlled practice exercises (e.g. gap fills, translation of sentences, drills) and spoken and written free production activities (e.g. solving problem situations and tasks). Games are sometimes employed as practice activities that enhance students' involvement and motivation.

6 Discussion of Findings

With respect to the research questions outlined in the methodology section, let us discuss the gathered data and provide results of the current research.

The questionnaire data proved that respondents are linguistically-aware teachers who base the way they teach English grammar on their beliefs about the importance of grammar in the process of language acquisition. The majority of participants expressed their belief that grammar does not have to be taught necessarily in every English lesson, however, teachers think that students of all language proficiency levels should learn grammar. This fact suggests that there is a focus on grammar in English lessons but its role does not seem to be assigned more importance than the role of, for instance, vocabulary or language skills.

As far as the process of grammar learning is concerned, there was neither a very strong agreement nor a strong disagreement on both the importance of the teacher's role in the process of grammar learning and natural communication as the best way of grammar learning. About one quarter of respondents think that students can learn grammar through communication in the language without a teacher. However, nearly one third of the teachers believe students cannot learn grammar only in communication and they can hardly do so as quickly and to the same extent as with a teacher. This is not to say that the latter group of teachers has a low opinion of their students' abilities to understand grammar and remember rules as the questionnaire data suggest the opposite. It rather shows that the respondents believe grammar is best learnt with some teacher's assistance and that formal learning is essential, too.

No uniform tendency could be observed also in the matter of necessity of explicit grammar teaching for students' ability to express themselves in a grammatically correct language since one half of teachers did but the other half did not agree with the statement. However, three quarters of respondents suggested that students' language knowledge should include theoretical knowledge of the English grammar system. This belief seems to be grounded both in teachers' perception of grammar rules as an aid in the process of language acquisition and in most teachers' impression that knowledge of the grammar system 'stored' in a learner's mind gives their students a feeling of security. In addition to a system of grammar rules, three quarters of teachers' reactions supported the idea of learning grammatical features first as fixed or semi-fixed units which more than one third of respondents described as a good material for subsequent inference of rules.

As far as grammar instruction is concerned, there was a strong agreement of the vast

majority of teachers both on the fact that a teacher should not start teaching grammar by explicit rule provision and the statement that introduction of rules and exceptions should not be a teacher's main task in English lessons. These data suggest that teachers do not tend to support the deductive approach and that they incline to language use as the starting point of instruction instead. However, when teachers were asked about the way they teach grammar in their English classes, nearly three quarters of respondents reported that they employ both the inductive and deductive designs. This fact indicates that teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching do not always correlate with their actual in-class practice they report.

As it could be seen from both the qualitative and quantitative questionnaire data, teachers give their students rules of formation and usage of grammatical features at some point during the grammar instruction process. Moreover, one half of participants reported that they believe their students expect the teacher to present grammar explicitly which can suggest that teachers observe and take into consideration what helps their students in grammar acquisition. The other half of respondents who reported that their students do not expect rules explained by the teacher either do not know their students' preferences for explicit or implicit rule presentation or they refer to the fact that students do not have any expectations regarding rules given by the teacher or students or no provision of rules at all. Nevertheless, whether based on the respondents' own and/or their students' beliefs, all teachers reported they infer grammatical rules from example sentences which they present to students. Moreover, almost all of the participants labelled this strategy as (very) effective.

This definite agreement corresponds with the figures of about 80% of respondents who reported using texts implying employment of context in teaching grammar and of almost all participants who expressed that grammar should not be taught separately from other communicative activities. All these results suggest a strong support of 'focus on form' instruction. We can broadly understand it as employment of meaningful communication context which serves for drawing students' attention to grammatical forms. Its advantage can be seen in focus on grammar form, meaning and use at the same time, which may help learners understand and remember a particular grammatical feature better than 'focus on forms' and 'focus on meaning'.¹ The above-mentioned observations together with the fact that more than 90% of participants stated they make use of students' abilities to create hypotheses about grammar which are later proved or disproved suggest again participants' tendency to employ inductive teaching design.

1 Nassaji and Fotos (2011: 10)

An aspect that seems to influence both teaching and learning grammar is teaching material used in the classroom. Almost 90% of respondents reported that a coursebook is the primary material used for teaching grammar in their classes and the majority of these teachers rated using coursebooks as very effective. A coursebook appears to be not only a source of texts and exercises but it also provides grammar aspects in a particular order which nearly all respondents follow. coursebooks and teacher's books, which are used by a lot of respondents as they expressed in the questionnaire, seem to influence what is taught in the classroom. Despite the fact a great number of teachers mentioned they draw on information in coursebooks and teacher's books they use in their lessons, the research findings indicate that teachers project their beliefs about grammar teaching in their lessons. This leads to the assumption that the contents of a coursebook are shaped by instructors so as to satisfy the needs of the classroom, i.e. student's needs. Nevertheless, this assumption would have to be confirmed by an additional research.

In comparison with the expressed popularity of coursebooks, non-adapted materials such as newspaper articles are frequently or occasionally employed in the lessons of about 40% of respondents. Additional 50% of participants reported a rare use of authentic materials in their grammar lessons. These rather low figures may be surprising if we consider that 70% of teachers evaluated non-adapted materials as (very) effective. There may be various reasons why authentic materials are not used to a greater extent which are not, however, the subject of the current research. It can be assumed that students' aversion and demotivation caused by non-adapted materials does not seem to be the most likely reason as three quarters of participants denied that their students have problems with already practised grammar in authentic materials.

Some further details that were observed from the questionnaire data include the fact that all teachers present grammar as a system of interrelated items based on comparison of a new grammatical feature that is contrasted with grammar students are already familiar with. This strategy was labelled as (very) effective by nearly all respondents as well as the strategies of visual presentation of grammar on the board and providing students with a great number of examples of grammatical features used in different communication situations. All teachers reported they use grammar terminology in the lessons which 70% of them rated as (very) effective. Linguistic terms seem to be used also by students as more than one half of teachers stated in the questionnaire. It can be thus assumed that grammar terminology is a part of students' language knowledge in some teachers' English classes.

Speaking about the overall process of grammar learning, 90% of teachers expressed that they believe practice is its most important part. The majority of respondents stated that students should practise grammar frequently and they should do so not only in controlled exercises but also in free production activities despite the fact the latter type of exercises can be challenging for some learners. About 70% of respondents reported that grammar practice activities should be set in a clear situational context. A comparable number of participants expressed that individual sentences are effective for practising grammar, too. It can be assumed that most teachers take advantage of both meaning-focused practice activities (e.g. problem-solving tasks which were reported to be employed by more than 90% of respondents) and more mechanical types of practice as well as mechanical drills which were reported to be used by 60% of participants. The data suggested that respondents are aware of advantages of the types of grammar practice mentioned with respect to particular grammatical features, stages of the practice process and, last but not least, their students' preferences.

An inevitable part of the grammar-learning process is producing errors. About three quarters of respondents stated that teachers should try to prevent students' errors before grammar practice and more than one half of respondents acknowledged that explicit grammar instruction can be helpful in that. The best prevention does not, however, lead to grammar perfection. When errors occur, teachers' task is to help learners eliminate them which can be done in various ways. As it could be observed in the questionnaire data, teachers distinguish error correction depending on the type and the aim of an activity. There was an agreement of about 90% of respondents who expressed that oral activities do not usually require correction of all students' errors. The strategy of highlighting all errors in the written language was supported by almost 70% of participants.

It is evident that teachers are rather tolerant of errors in fluency activities where especially the errors that change the meaning of the communicated message are focused on and corrected. The activity type also influences teachers' choice of the way and timing of correction (e.g. correction at the end of an activity). Encouraging students to self-correct is seen by all participants as a (very) effective strategy which is often employed in their lessons. One of the advantages of self-correction mentioned in the questionnaire is the development of learner autonomy. The majority of teachers stated they assist their students by scaffolding techniques so that they arrive at the correct version of their utterance. If students are not able to self-correct and it is apparent that the problem lies in their misapprehension of a grammatical feature, all teachers' reactions suggested that the particular grammar should be

explained and practised again even if it means a change in the lesson plan.

All respondents stated they compare Czech and English grammar and they show their students differences and similarities of both language systems. In the view of 70% of respondents, this strategy proves to be (very) effective for their students. Some teachers expressed their distaste for using Czech in English lessons, nevertheless, they admitted that if it is helpful for their students' learning, they do not hesitate to switch to Czech. Moreover, using Czech during grammar explanation has an advantage also for teachers since the mother tongue enables them to make sure that students understand what the teacher says.

From the overall perspective, when respondents were asked to provide description of their grammar-teaching method, it could be seen that teachers understood the term 'method' as an umbrella term which groups the concepts of approach, procedure, technique etc. Some teachers gave a more or less detailed description of their usual grammar lessons, other teachers spoke about eclecticism and they operated with the concept of method that can refer to GTM, Direct Method etc. while other participants spoke about the PPP model of teaching grammar. The rest of the respondents described factors that influence their decisions about teaching grammar in different contexts. The question that primarily sought information about teachers' theoretical principles and classroom procedures thus offered also the respondents' interpretation of the word 'method' that has been understood in different ways in the context of ELT.

As far as the generalisability of the data findings, the high number of participants and their plentiful comments with respect to the length of the whole questionnaire inevitably lead to the assumption that the participants who completed the questionnaire may not be considered a representative sample of the population of Czech teachers of English. The respondents can be regarded rather as a sample of teachers who like teaching English including English grammar. Their interest in the topic was further indicated by one half of respondents who wrote their email addresses in order to be informed about the final results of the research. Nevertheless, with respect to the fact that about 500 teachers who were sent a link to the questionnaire were selected randomly and the choice of schools was not limited to particular Czech towns or regions, we can assume that there is a number of Czech teachers of English who resemble our sample even though they do not probably represent the whole population of English teachers in the country.

7 Conclusion

The theoretical part of the thesis provided an overview of selected grammar-teaching methods and approaches that have appeared in the field of ELT throughout the history and it described different grammar-learning models. Moreover, it introduced the concept of teacher cognition which is concerned with teachers' knowledge and beliefs that are applied in the teaching process. The practical part analysed both quantitative and qualitative data received in a questionnaire survey among high-school and grammar-school English teachers in the Czech Republic.

The questionnaire was completed by 93 respondents most of whom provided a great number of comments on questionnaire items which allowed some additional findings besides inferences based on quantitative data. To our surprise, as many as 38 teachers added comments on an optional question that asked them to describe their grammar-teaching method. The descriptions enabled us to observe teachers' beliefs and imagine how respondents teach grammar in their lessons. In addition, information in the comments could be compared with teachers' reactions to obligatory items which lead to the conclusion that most teachers' beliefs are consistent with their reported practice.

As far as it could be observed, the way teachers address the issue of the choice of the most appropriate and the most effective way of teaching grammar varies greatly and it is generally influenced by a number of factors. One of the fundamental variables which plays a role in the problem is the teachers' perception of language including the purpose of learning grammar. Even though the respondents' reactions indicated neither a purely functional nor a strictly formal view of language among teachers, it is evident that teaching grammar has an important position in the process of language acquisition and it is viewed as a part of the language which helps students improve their language proficiency.

As far as grammar instruction is concerned, both inductive and deductive approaches are employed in the lessons. Teachers generally seem to promote the inductive design which puts learners in the foreground and engages them in discovery activities. Teachers, however, do not believe that the approach which imitates the process of native speakers' language acquisition to certain extent, is suitable for teaching all grammatical features and all students. Therefore, deduction is employed as a starting point of instruction, too. Grammar rules that help students construct a theoretical grammar system in their interlanguage are provided in the lessons and are believed to be effective for learners. We can thus speak about the explicit-inductive framework as a frequently employed grammar-instruction design in English

classrooms.

Learners are mostly exposed to the input that allows them to see a number of examples of grammatical features used in a communicative context of sentences or texts. It was observed that 'focus on form' instruction which integrates advantages of instruction in communicative classrooms and separate attention to linguistic forms is applied by most teachers. This indicates teachers' tendency to diverge from traditional 'focus on forms' that teaches discrete points of grammar and 'focus on meaning' that is concerned with understanding the communicative message. At the same time, we can see that teachers seem to reflect the recent trend in ELT which supports teaching grammar as a necessary part of language instruction.

Regarding practice of grammar, it is viewed as the most important part of grammar learning that gives students space to test their hypotheses about grammar. Teachers adopt a role of an assistant in the process: they promote learners' autonomy, instead of providing a correct answer as a reaction to students' errors, they support learners by cues and questions which guide students to arrive at the solution themselves. Peer teaching and assistance among students appear to be an option teachers like to employ in their classrooms, too. The whole process seems to originate in teachers' beliefs in students' active participation as an effective way of understanding the underlying logic of grammar, its internalization and creation of links with other grammatical features.

In reference to other aspects of grammar teaching, L1 is often used by teachers during explanation in order that all students understand what is discussed and sometimes in the course of grammar practice (e.g. translation of sentences from/into Czech). L1 is used also for comparison and contrast of similarities and differences between Czech and English grammar systems. The use of L1 supported by most teachers seems to indicate two facts. Firstly, teachers do not seem to be influenced by prescriptions banning the use of L1 justified by the need of students' maximal exposure to the target language (e.g. the communicative method). Secondly, teachers' support of L1 contribution to students' L2 learning implies the primary focus of grammar-teaching process on the learner.

One important fact that could be observed is the popularity of coursebooks as the principal grammar-instructional materials among teachers. Besides the use of a coursebook as a source of texts and exercises, the coursebook syllabus seems to be followed to the extent that it can play a role of a course syllabus. The question is whether following a coursebook to such an extent is intentional and based on teachers' prior careful consideration of different

options or whether it is a result of a blind trust in the authority of the book. The findings of the current research do not provide a clear answer and, therefore, further investigation into the matter is suggested.

As it could be observed, teaching grammar is closely connected with teachers as experienced practitioners who draw on their experience both from the perspectives of a student who was taught grammar in a particular way during his or her studies of foreign languages and a teacher who is able to reflect the success and failure of strategies, activities etc. with respect to his or her students. In addition, it could be seen that teachers are equipped with theoretical knowledge of at least the major approaches and methods which provide them with possible frameworks of grammar teaching. These factors promote teachers from proficient language users to linguistically-aware professionals who are able to play roles of decision-makers, strategy-planners and evaluators.

The activity of teaching seems to be strongly influenced by students' general and specific needs and language goals which make the whole process of teaching learner-centered. Teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction proved to be shaped by the context of a classroom environment. Teachers explicitly admitted and/or their reactions implied that their beliefs about how English grammar should be taught are often submitted to learners' specific needs, learning styles, preferences of grammar-instructional models etc. Grammar teaching thus does not seem to be a mechanical process, i.e. teachers know what they are doing and they are able to give meaningful reasons for their actions with different students.

The decision-making process in grammar teaching was reflected in the respondents' descriptions of their grammar-teaching methods which demonstrated that the majority of them do not understand 'method' as a label for "a set of theoretical principles or classroom procedures associated with a particular language teaching method" (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 32) but as a concept which represents a method constructed by a teacher based on his or her personal beliefs of how to teach grammar, experience that tells him or her why to teach grammar in a particular way with a particular group of learners and, last but not least, specific strategies, activities, materials etc.

Even though the core of teachers' methods can be seen in established methods which were described in language-teaching methodology books, it could be noticed that the descriptions of teachers' methods differ from the methodological concepts as well as from each other. In order to put such an actively critical and evaluative position of teachers in the process of language teaching to a larger theoretical framework, we may refer to a concept

nowadays called 'post-method era' or 'post-method pedagogy' which is currently seen as a solution to the eternal search for the best method which could be used by two teachers on two opposite sides of the world by giving the right to devise the best method to teachers themselves¹.

¹ See section 2.4.15.

Résumé

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá přístupy a postoji českých učitelů k výuce gramatiky v hodinách anglického jazyka na středních odborných školách a gymnáziích. Práce se zaměřuje na šíři povědomí učitelů o problematice učení gramatiky anglického jazyka a zjišťuje, jak toto povědomí ovlivňuje praxi učitelů a zda jim pomáhá utvářet vlastní postupy, či zda spíše přejímají určité vzory. Cílem této práce není hodnotit způsob, jakým čeští učitelé vyučují anglickou gramatiku jako správný nebo nesprávný, a to nejen z důvodu, že výuka gramatiky angličtiny jako cizího jazyka byla a stále je předmětem sporu jak učitelů, tak metodologů, kde každá strana zastává na danou problematiku určitý názor. Výzkum však dodnes nepřinesl jasnou zprávu o tom, jaký způsob výuky gramatiky cizích jazyků lze považovat za správný a otázkou zůstává, jestli vůbec jediný nejlepší způsob existuje. Práce si proto spíše klade za cíl porozumět a popsat podněty, které motivují učitele v jejich postupech v rámci výuky anglické gramatiky.

Práce je rozdělena na dvě hlavní části, a to teoretickou a praktickou. Teoretická část obsahuje dvě dílčí části. První z nich seznamuje s vývojem pohledů na gramatiku v rámci jazyka a podává přehled vybraných hlavních přístupů a metod výuky gramatiky angličtiny, které byly zaznamenány především v průběhu 20. století. Ve středověku byla gramatika základem výuky jazyků a vývoje učebních materiálů. Na konci středověku byla v západním světě jazykem vzdělání, obchodu a církve latina. Přestože se postupně stala mrtvým jazykem, její gramatický systém byl stále vnímán jako příklad ideálního jazyka a stal se tak vzorem pro výuku cizích jazyků včetně angličtiny. Smysl učení cizího jazyka, které se zakládalo na memorování gramatických pravidel, byl spatřován v jakémsi duchovním cvičení, které mělo za úkol připravit žáky pro další studium nebo dokonce pomoci porozumět vlastnímu rodnému jazyku.

Na vzoru učení řečtiny a latiny byla založena gramaticko-překladová metoda, jejíž prvky se užívají dodnes. Tato metoda chápe jazyk jako systém pravidel, jejichž osvojení se rovná osvojení jazyka. Pravidla jsou prezentována učitelem, žák má spíše roli pasivní. Jak název napovídá, tato metoda využívá překladu vět mezi cizím jazykem a žakovou mateřštinou. Velký důraz je kladen na gramatickou správnost, zatímco rozvoji komunikace v jazyce je věnována velmi malá pozornost. Pro učitele je tato metoda výhodná ve snadném plánování a kontrole nad obsahem hodiny, proto je také někdy využívána začínajícími učiteli. K důležité změně v přístupu k výuce gramatiky dochází koncem 19. století v rámci tzv. reformního hnutí, které reagovalo na nedostatky gramaticko-překladové metody. Místo

samostatných vět se při výuce využívalo ucelených textů, používání mateřského jazyka se omezilo na občasné vysvětlení a důraz byl kladen na použití jazyka; žáci tedy začali vyučovaným jazykem mluvit.

Hlavní pilíře reformního hnutí daly vzniknout na konci 19. století přímé metodě, jejímž hlavním principem bylo učení jazyka přirozenou cestou, tedy způsobem, jakým se učí člověk svůj rodný jazyk. V hodině se používal pouze cílový jazyk a pro učení gramatiky se využíval induktivní přístup. Učitel gramatiku nevysvětloval, žáci si měli gramatická pravidla odvodit sami během komunikace a okamžitě je začít během mluvení používat. Nedostatky přímé metody vedly například k tomu, že student byl schopný bezchybně odpovědět na otázku, ale sám žádnou vytvořit nedokázal. První metodou, která byla vytvořena metodologicky ve svém oboru byl orální přístup A.S. Hornbyho a Harolda Palmera, který chápal jazyk jako strukturu. Učitelé nevysvětlovali gramatiku explicitně, ale využívali substitučních tabulek, které však často nevedly ke kýženému výsledku podobně jako přímá metoda.

Strukturní pojetí jazyka může být pozorováno také u audiolingvální metody ze 60. let, která byla založena na principech podmiňování a jako hlavního výukového prostředku využívala drilových cvičení. Jedním ze základů této metody byla kontrastivní analýza mateřštiny a cílového jazyka, která měla za cíl dopředu odhalit případné studentovy nesnáze při učení cizího jazyka a předejít chybám způsobeným interferencí s mateřštinou. Pro své hlavní body byla audiolingvální metoda později zpochybněna těmi, kteří ve studentových chybách spatřovali součást procesu systematického ověřování hypotéz, které jsou nedílnou součástí procesu učení se jazyka.

V 70. a 80. letech byl zaznamenán návrat k explicitnímu vysvětlování gramatiky jako nutné součásti osvojení si cizího jazyka. Zčásti se jednalo o reakci na komunikativní přístup k výuce jazyků, který explicitní vysvětlování a opravování gramatických chyb odmítal jako zbytečné. V současné době se jako velmi častý model učení gramatiky objevuje PPP, kdy učitel nejprve látku **p**rezentuje, pak ji studenti **p**rocvičí a nakonec využijí ve volném projevu (**p**rodukce). Tento model byl kritizován kvůli své víře ve studentovo automatické osvojení gramatických jevů v pořadí, ve kterém jsou prezentovány. Ve výuce angličtiny se objevilo mnoho podob PPP, které jednotlivé fáze kombinují v různém pořadí, opakují je atp.

První sekce teoretické části je zakončena úvahou o současném trendu v oblasti výuky jazyků, tzv. období post-metodickém, které vychází z předpokladu, že pojem metoda je konstrukt navržený pro všeobecný kontext, jenž nebere v úvahu proměnné žáků ani učitelů, kteří se navzájem liší ve svých názorech, schopnostech, zkušenostech atp. Ačkoli metoda má

stále ve výuce jazyků své pevné místo, post-metodický trend nám říká, že učitelé začali na metodu pohlížet nikoli jako na autoritu, jejíž předpisy je potřeba doslovně plnit, ale jako na oblast pro reflexi, která učitelům dovoluje zaujmout k zavedeným metodám kritický postoj. Učitelé jsou tak schopni lépe zhodnotit prvky metod a utvářet vlastní teorie a strategie pro výuku v souladu se svými názory a specifickými potřebami žáků. Odklání se tak od věčného hledání ideální metody a namísto toho spíše směřují k hledání alternativ k metodám. Post-metodické teorie by se mohly snadno jevit jako nový název pro eklekticismus, který je založen na kombinování různých metod a přístupů. Své východisko však eklekticismus nevidí v kritickém pohledu na věc a nebere v potaz výše zmíněné ani jiné proměnné účastníků procesu výuky a učení.

Na výše popsanou podčást volně navazuje druhá sekce teoretické části, která se zabývá kognitivními procesy učitelů (tzv. *teacher cognition*). Uznání významu *teacher cognition* ve výuce jazyků předcházelo období první poloviny 20. století, které vidělo úspěch výuky jazyka ve správném uplatnění metody a neúspěch naopak v neschopnosti danou metodu použít. V druhé polovině 20. století se dostává do středu pozornosti výzkumu učitel jako ten, který nese zodpovědnost za proces výuky a učení jazyka. V 60. letech byl v duchu behaviorismu chápán proces učení jazyka jako přímý výsledek učitelova chování a postojů. V 70. letech přinesla tehdy právě vzniklá vědní disciplína kognitivní psychologie poznatky o vlivu učitelových názorů týkajících se jazyka, jeho funkce a mimo jiné i gramatiky na způsob, jakým učitelé jazyk vyučují. Na učitele se tak přestalo pohlížet jako na pasivní uživatele teorií předepsaných lingvisty a metodology a začali být vnímáni jako profesionálové schopní vlastních rozhodnutí ve svém oboru.

Pokud se zaměříme na výuku gramatiky, zjistíme, že z hlediska názorů učitelů se jedná o poněkud sporné téma. Stále se například nedosáhlo shody, jestli je lepší vyučovat gramatiku explicitně nebo implicitně či jestli je efektivnější učení pomocí dedukce nebo indukce. Asi každý učitel má na tyto a další problémy spojené s výukou gramatiky nějaké názory, a právě tyto názory společně s hypotézami o jazyce, gramatice a učení jazyka a gramatiky utvářejí koncept TLA (Teacher Language Awareness), který odlišuje učitele od velmi pokročilého mluvčího. Výzkum ukázal, že učitelovy názory formují také jeho zkušenosti z vlastního studia cizích jazyků. Pokud se jedná o zkušenosti dobré, učitelé často učí gramatiku podobně jako jejich vlastní učitelé. Někdy se dokonce ukazuje, že vliv těchto zkušeností na způsob výuky je silnější než poznatky z odborné metodologické literatury. V 80. letech se začaly blíže zkoumat další faktory, které vstupují do procesu učitelova rozhodování o výuce, např. studentovy

charakteristiky jako věk, jazyková úroveň, vrozené učební vlohy, styl učení, motivace atp. Dále se také často mluví o vlivu ze strany školy, na které učitel působí, nebo požadavcích ze strany rodičů.

Tato diplomová práce vychází z předpokladu, že rozhodnutí a konání učitelů v rámci výuky cizího jazyka jsou výsledkem toho, co učitelé znají, co si myslí a v co věří. Výzkumná část této práce pozoruje a popisuje názory učitelů na výuku a učení se anglické gramatiky a snaží se porovnat vyjádřené názory s postupy ve výuce gramatiky v hodinách anglického jazyka, tak jak je učitelé popsali nebo nepřímě vyjádřili. Výzkum se zaměřil na několik hlavních oblastí, a to: přístupy ve výuce anglické gramatiky, procvičování gramatiky, opravování gramatických chyb, užití mateřského jazyka ve výuce gramatiky a používání učebnic při výuce gramatiky. Kromě toho práce pozoruje pojetí metody očima učitelů vzhledem k výše popsanému post-metodickému období, které nově vymezuje vztah metody a učitele jako tvořivého a kritického jedince.

Hlavním nástrojem pro výzkum k této diplomové práci je dotazník, který se částečně skládá z otázek vytvořených autorem této práce a částečně z otázek převzatých ze dvou dříve publikovaných studií, jež se zabývají stejným tématem jako tato práce. Elektronický dotazník obsahující 77 otázek, který vyplnilo 93 středoškolských učitelů angličtiny, poskytl jak kvantitativní, tak kvalitativní data, která byla analyzována a vyhodnocena vzhledem k hlavním výzkumným otázkám. K autorově překvapení poskytla více než třetina respondentů poměrně velké množství komentářů k nepovinné otevřené otázce, která učitele žádala, aby popsali svoji metodu výuky anglické gramatiky. Odpovědi na tuto otázku poskytly cenná data, která umožnila lépe porozumět názorům učitelů vyjádřených ve zbylých částech dotazníku. Dále také naznačila, že praxe učitelů v hodinách angličtiny je obecně v souladu s jejich názory na výuku anglické gramatiky.

Na základě výzkumu lze usuzovat, že čeští učitelé se poměrně liší v přístupech k výuce gramatiky anglického jazyka. To, co jedni pokládají za efektivní způsob výuky, jiní považují za způsob pro své studenty docela neúčinný. Všichni učitelé se však shodují v názoru, že gramatika má své důležité místo ve výuce jazyka a její učení je potřebné pro studentovo neustálé zlepšování a posunu žakovy jazykové úrovně.

Co se týče samotného vyučování gramatiky, učitelé ve svých hodinách uplatňují jak deduktivní, tak induktivní přístup, přičemž učení pomocí indukce, které aktivně zapojuje žáka do samostatného zkoumání gramatiky, je učiteli prosazováno jako účinnější. Zároveň se ukazuje, že učitelé spíše nevěří v učení gramatiky na způsob osvojování mateřského jazyka,

tedy téměř bez jakékoli učitelovy asistence a bez jakýchkoli vyslovených gramatických pravidel. Tento způsob může podle učitelů přinést kýžený výsledek pouze u některých studentů a v případě vybraných gramatických jevů. Gramatická pravidla jsou podle učitelů důležitá a studentům pomáhají budovat a neustále doplňovat jejich vlastní vnitřní gramatický systém. Jako velmi častým a oblíbeným způsobem výuky gramatiky se tak jeví explicitně-induktivní model.

Jak učitelé uvádějí, při výuce gramatiky pomáhá studentům určitý situační kontext daný například textem. Studenti jsou vystaveni množství příkladů, které jim ukazují použití gramatiky v různých situacích. Výzkum naznačuje, že učitelé uplatňují tzv. přístup *focus on form*, který prezentuje gramatické jevy v komunikačním kontextu a kombinuje tak výhody komunikativního přístupu a představení samostatných gramatických forem. Jako nejdůležitější součást celého procesu výuky gramatiky je podle učitelů procvičování, které umožňuje studentům potvrzovat si a vyvracet své hypotézy o jazyce. Učitelé zaujímají roli asistenta. Pokud mají studenti při procvičování problémy, podporují je učitelé návodnými otázkami. Studentovy chyby neopravují, ale spíše žáky nutí, aby na správné řešení přišli sami. Výhody učitelé spatřují i v tzv. *peer teaching*, tedy práci ve dvojici nebo skupině založené na vzájemné asistenci studentů. Celý proces procvičování je založen na názoru učitelů, že aktivní zapojení pomáhá žákům lépe porozumět gramatickému systému a snáze si jej tak osvojit.

Na poli výuky cizích jazyků se často objevuje téma výhod a nevýhod zapojení žákova mateřského jazyka ve výuce cizích jazyků. Výsledky výzkumu této práce ukazují, že čeština se při výuce gramatiky angličtiny používá poměrně často, a to hlavně při vysvětlování gramatických jevů z důvodu studentova lepšího porozumění výkladu a někdy také jako nástroj procvičování (např. v překladových větách). Učitelé porovnávají anglický a český gramatický systém a ukazují studentům podobnosti a odlišnosti jazyků ve víře, že studentům usnadní pochopení anglické gramatiky. Výzkum dále ukázal, že většina učitelů používá při výuce gramatiky učebnice jako zdroj textů a cvičení. Zdá se, že učitelé se řídí učebnicí do té míry, že syllabus učebnice se stává i syllabem předmětu. Otázkou zde je, zda se tak děje vědomě a po pečlivém zhodnocení pořadí prezentovaných jevů. Tuto otázku však naše práce není schopna zodpovědět a nabízí se tak jako téma dalšího výzkumu.

Podle provedeného výzkumu lze usuzovat, že učitelé jsou ve svých názorech na výuku gramatiky angličtiny ovlivňováni především vlastními zkušenostmi s výukou studentů, svou zkušeností ze studia cizích jazyků a znalostí alespoň nejdůležitějších přístupů a metod výuky jazyků. Celý proces výuky gramatiky je silně zaměřen na studenty a jejich potřeby a cíle,

kterým učitelé výuku přizpůsobují. Pojem metodu nechápou učitelé jako soubor předepsaných zásad a postupů spojovaných s konkrétní metodou výuky cizího jazyka, ale spíše jako soubor svých přístupů, strategií a oblíbených aktivit založených na vlastních názorech a zkušenostech. Jako zajímavá se jeví rozmanitost metod jednotlivých učitelů. Přestože je v metodách učitelů často patrný základ zavedených metod, jen málokdy najdeme dva učitele, kteří by učili gramatiku naprosto stejným způsobem.

References

- Andrews, S. "Metalinguistic Awareness and Teacher Explanation". *Language Awareness*, 6. 1997: 147-161.
- Andrews, S. "All These Like Little Name Things: A Comparative Study of Language Teachers' Explicit Knowledge of Grammar and Grammatical Terminology". *Language Awareness*, 8. 1999: 143-159.
- Andrews, S. "Teacher Language Awareness and the Professional Knowledge Base of the L2 Teacher". *Language Awareness*, 12. 2003: 81-95.
- Ayash Ezzi, N. A. "Yemeni Teachers' Beliefs of Grammar Teaching and Classroom Practices." *Canadian Center of Science and Education* 9 July 2012: 170-184.
- Borg, S. "Teachers' Theories in Grammar Teaching." *ELT Journal* 53/3 3 July 1999a: 157-167.
- Borg, S. "The Use of Grammatical Terminology in the Second Language Classroom: A Qualitative Study of Teachers' Practices and Cognitions". *Applied Linguistics* 20/1. Oxford University Press, 1999b: 95-126.
- Borg, S. "Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: A Review of Research on What Language Teachers Think, Know, Believe, and Do." *Language Teaching*, 2003. 36(2): 81-109.
- Borg, S. *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Borg, S. "Language Teacher Education". In J. Simpson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge, 2011: 215-228.
- Burgess, J., Etherington, S. "Focus on Grammatical Form: Explicit or Implicit? *Elsevier Science Ltd*. 2 May 2002: 433-458.
- Dörnyei, Z. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration and Processing*. Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2009.
- Harmer, J. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3rd ed. Longman, 2001.
- Harmer, J. *How to Teach English*. Longman, 2007.
- Hinkel, E. and Fotos, S. *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2008. Google Books. <http://www.google.cz/books?hl=en&lr=&id=mMGQAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=New+perspectives+on+grammar+teaching+in+second+language+classrooms&ots=UptCW_NQU1&

[sig=8Mzb7m-nEXoL5fi8VcbkzXYWqB8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=New%20perspectives%20on%20grammar%20teaching%20in%20second%20language%20classrooms&f=false](http://www.sig=8Mzb7m-nEXoL5fi8VcbkzXYWqB8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=New%20perspectives%20on%20grammar%20teaching%20in%20second%20language%20classrooms&f=false)>. 26 Sep. 2014.

- Howatt, A.P.R. *A History of English Language Teaching*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hudson, R. "Grammar". *Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Ed. Margie Berns. Boston, MA: Elsevier, 2009. 126-129.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. "The Postmethod Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching". *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 28, No. 1. Spring, 1994. 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. Yale University Press, 2003.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. *Teaching Language, From Grammar to Grammar*. Heinle ELT, 2003.
- Mothejzík, J. *Methodology for TEFL Teachers*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství Praha, 1988.
- Nassaji, H., and Fotos, S.S. *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms*. Routledge, 2011.
- Richards, J.C., and Rodgers, T.S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Scheffler, P. and Cinciala, M. "Explicit Grammar Rules and L2 Acquisition". *ELT Journal* Volume 65/1 January 2011: 13-23.
- Střední školy. <<http://www.stredniskoly.cz/seznam-skol/>>. 30 Sep. 2014.
- Swan, M. "Does Grammar Teaching Work?" *Modern English Teacher* 15(2). 2006: 5-13. <<http://www.mikeswan.co.uk/elt-applied-linguistics/teaching-grammar.htm>>. 26 Sep. 2014.
- Thornbury, S. "Language Teaching Methodology". *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Ed. James Simpson. Routledge, 2011. 185-199.
- Ur, P. *A Course in English Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- "Výuka cizích jazyků ve školách v letech 2005-2008". *Česká školní inspekce*. <<http://www.csicr.cz/cz/DOKUMENTY/Tematicke-zpravy/Vyuka-cizich-jazyku-ve-skolach-v-letech-2005-2008>>. 26 Sep. 2014.

Appendix I: Pilot Questionnaire

Přístupy a postoje učitelů k výuce gramatiky angličtiny

*Tento dotazník se skládá z šesti částí. Přečtěte si prosím pokyny pro vyplnění každé z nich a zaznamenejte svoji odpověď. Cílem tohoto dotazníku **není** hodnotit Vás jako učitele, a proto neexistuje žádná správná nebo nesprávná odpověď.*

Tento dotazník je pilotní verzí dotazníku, který použiji pro výzkum v rámci mé diplomové práce. Buďte prosím kritičtí a označte či připojte poznámky k jakékoli části dotazníku. Budu Vám velice vděčná za připomínky a návrhy pro zlepšení formální i obsahové stránky dotazníku. Předem děkuji za Vaši spolupráci.

A. Označte prosím, do jaké míry souhlasíte s následujícími tvrzeními týkajícími se výuky anglické gramatiky. Ke každé otázce vyberte prosím vždy pouze jednu odpověď a označte ji písmenem X. Odpovězte prosím na všechny otázky.

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM
1. Studenti se mohou naučit angličtinu i bez učitelova výkladu gramatiky.				
2. Gramatiku se studenti naučí nejlépe kontaktem s jazykem a během přirozené komunikace v angličtině.				
3. Studenti se mohou naučit gramatické struktury jako ustálené nebo poloustálené výrazy a fráze.				
4. Studentova znalost angličtiny by měla mimo jiné zahrnovat teoretickou znalost gramatického systému a způsobu jeho fungování.				
5. Výuka gramatiky by měla být hlavní součástí výuky jazyka.				
6. Přímá (frontální, explicitní) výuka gramatiky je nezbytná pro studentovu schopnost gramaticky správně se vyjadřovat.				
7. Gramatiku by se měli učit studenti všech úrovní znalosti jazyka (začátečníci, středně pokročilí i pokročilí).				
8. Je důležité zaměřit se na gramatiku během každé hodiny angličtiny.				
9. Výuka gramatiky musí probíhat odděleně od komunikačních aktivit.				
10. Procvičování gramatiky pomocí samostatných vět je ve výuce gramatiky užitečné.				

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM
11. Užití gramatických jevů ve volném projevu je nezbytnou součástí procesu učení se gramatiky.				
12. Místo detailního plánování by se měl učitel zaměřit na gramatické jevy, se kterými mají studenti potíže během komunikačních aktivit.				
13. Učitel by měl začít výuku gramatiky teoretickým vysvětlením gramatické struktury.				
14. Hlavní součástí výuky gramatiky v hodině by mělo být procvičování gramatických jevů.				
15. Časté/pravidelné procvičování gramatických jevů významně přispívá ke studentově schopnosti správně a přesně používat gramatiku.				
16. Hlavním úkolem učitele během výuky gramatiky je vysvětlovat nová gramatická pravidla a výjimky.				
17. Procvičování gramatických jevů musí vždy probíhat v určitém kontextu daném komunikační situací.				
18. Procvičování mechanickým drilem je užitečné pro výuku a učení se jazyka.				
19. Přímé (explicitní, frontální) vysvětlení gramatiky pomáhá studentům úspěšně opravit vlastní gramatické chyby.				
20. Učitel by měl opravovat všechny gramatické chyby, kterých se studenti dopustí během ústních cvičení.				
21. Učitel by měl označit všechny gramatické chyby, kterých se studenti dopustí během psaných cvičení.				
22. Pro studenty je velmi obtížné vyvarovat se gramatických chyb, protože anglická gramatika je příliš komplexní/složitá.				
23. Není potřeba, aby se studenti vyjadřovali v gramaticky zcela bezchybných větách, pokud dokáží vyjádřit, co chtějí.				

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM
24. Učitel by měl opravovat pouze gramatické chyby, které mění smysl studentovy výpovědi.				
25. Učitel by se měl snažit předcházet možným studentovým chybám již během výkladu gramatiky.				
26. Studenti se nenaučí všechny gramatické jevy a pravidla probíraná v hodinách angličtiny, protože jim nejsou schopni porozumět a zapamatovat si je.				
27. Moji studenti očekávají, že jim novou gramatiku vyložím přímo (explicitně).				
28. Moji studenti mají potíže s užitím gramatických jevů ve volném vyjadřování.				
29. Moji studenti upřednostňují pro učení gramatiky příklady samostatných vět.				
31. Již procvičené gramatické jevy obsažené v autentických materiálech (např. textu, poslechu) dělají mým studentům problémy.				
32. Teoretická znalost gramatického systému dodává mým studentům pocit jistoty.				
33. Moji studenti se učí gramatické jevy jako fráze a ustálené výrazy, ze kterých si později odvozují pravidla pro jejich tvoření a užití.				

B. Jak učíte Vy sám/sama gramatiku ve svých hodinách angličtiny? Vyberte prosím pouze jednu možnost a označte ji písmenem X. Zvolíte-li č.4, krátce prosím popište.

1. Nejprve studentům představím nový gramatický jev a s ním spojená pravidla a poté jim dám příklady použití dané gramatiky.	
2. Nejprve dám studentům příklady použití gramatického jevu a poté je vybidnu, aby gramatická pravidla odvodili z příkladů sami.	
3. Využívám postupu (1.) i (2.).	
4. Nevyužívám ani postupu (1.) ani (2.). Využívám jiného postupu (krátce jej prosím uveďte):	

C. Následující tabulka obsahuje výukové strategie, kterých mohou učitelé využívat při výuce gramatiky cizího jazyka. Označte prosím, jak často daných strategií využíváte ve svých hodinách angličtiny. Vyberte vždy pouze jednu možnost a označte ji písmenem X.

	NIKDY	ZŘÍDKA	OBČAS	ČASTO
1. Při výuce gramatiky používám češtinu (např. překlad pojmů, vysvětlení pravidel).				
2. Gramatiku vysvětluji psanou formou (např. píšu gramatické jevy, pravidla nebo příklady na tabuli).				
3. Při výuce gramatiky dávám studentům co nejvíce příkladů užití daného jevu.				
4. Studentovy gramatické chyby opravuji během všech aktivit.				
5. Gramatická pravidla názorně odvozují z příkladů, které studentům představím.				
6. Při výuce anglické gramatiky hledám podobnosti a odlišnosti od českého gramatického systému.				
7. Při ústních cvičeních procvičuji gramatické struktury mechanickým drilem.				
8. Nový gramatický jev porovnávám se studentům již známou gramatikou angličtiny.				
9. Gramatické jevy předkládám studentům v rámci ucelených textů (např. krátkého příběhu).				
10. Během výuky gramatiky používám gramatickou terminologii (např. termín „past continuous tense“).				
11. Při výuce gramatiky používám neupravené autentické materiály (např. články z časopisů).				
12. Při výuce gramatiky využívám studentových schopností tvořit si určité hypotézy o gramatice, které si později potvrdí nebo vyvrátí.				
13. Pokud mají studenti potíže při procvičování gramatiky, pomáhám jim návodnými otázkami.				
14. Jako hlavní učební materiál používám při výuce gramatiky učebnici, kterou mají všichni studenti.				
15. Gramatické jevy vysvětluji v pořadí, ve kterém je uvádí lekce učebnice.				

D. Označte prosím míru účinnosti daných strategií výuky anglické gramatiky vzhledem k Vaším studentům. Vyberte vždy pouze jednu možnost a označte ji písmenem X.

	NIKDY	ZŘÍDKA	OBČAS	ČASTO
1. Při výuce gramatiky používám češtinu (např. překlad pojmů, vysvětlení pravidel).				
2. Gramatiku vysvětluji psanou formou (např. píšu gramatické jevy, pravidla nebo příklady na tabuli).				
3. Při výuce gramatiky dávám studentům co nejvíce příkladů užití daného jevu.				
4. Studentovy gramatické chyby opravuji během všech aktivit.				
5. Gramatická pravidla názorně odvozují z příkladů, které studentům představím.				
6. Při výuce anglické gramatiky hledám podobnosti a odlišnosti od českého gramatického systému.				
7. Při ústních cvičeních procvičuji gramatické struktury mechanickým drilem.				
8. Nový gramatický jev porovnávám se studentům již známou gramatikou angličtiny.				
9. Gramatické jevy předkládám studentům v rámci ucelených textů (např. krátkého příběhu).				
10. Během výuky gramatiky používám gramatickou terminologii (např. termín „past continuous tense“).				
11. Při výuce gramatiky používám neupravené autentické materiály (např. články z časopisů).				
12. Při výuce gramatiky využívám studentových schopností tvořit si určité hypotézy o gramatice, které si později potvrdí nebo vyvrátí.				
13. Pokud mají studenti potíže při procvičování gramatiky, pomáhám jim návodnými otázkami.				
14. Jako hlavní učební materiál používám při výuce gramatiky učebnici, kterou mají všichni studenti.				
15. Gramatické jevy vysvětluji v pořadí, ve kterém je uvádí lekce učebnice.				

E. Na závěr prosím poskytněte několik informací o sobě. Písmenem X označte prosím platnou odpověď/odpovědi.

1. *Stupeň školy nebo škol, na kterých učíte anglický jazyk:*

střední odborná škola	
gymnázium	

2. *Délka Vaší praxe výuky anglického jazyka:*

méně než 1 rok	
1-5 let	
5-10 let	
více než 10 let	

3. Vaše nejvyšší dosažené vzdělání je:

nepedagogického zaměření	
pedagogického zaměření	

a to:

SŠ s maturitou	
VOŠ	
bakalářské	
magisterské	
doktorské	
JINÉ (uveďte prosím druh Vaší kvalifikace):	

4. Způsob, kterým vyučuji **gramatiku** angličtiny byl ovlivněn zejména (písmenem X označte prosím libovolný počet platných možností):

účastí na didaktických seminářích na SŠ/VOŠ/VŠ	
materiální a metodickou podporou ze strany školy, na které vyučuji	
příkladem učitele během vlastního studia cizího jazyka (na ZŠ, SŠ, jazykové škole atp.)	
používanými učebnicemi (student's books) v mých hodinách angličtiny	
metodickými a didaktickými příručkami	
využíváním metodické knihy pro učitele (teacher's book)	
vlastní zkušeností s vyučováním studentů	
JINÉ (uveďte prosím):	

F. Otázka na závěr:

Ve výuce jazyků se často mluví o METODĚ. Máte nějakou svoji metodu učení gramatiky angličtiny?

.....

Pokud ano, krátce ji prosím popište.

.....

Máte-li zájem, uveďte svoji emailovou adresu, na kterou Vám s radostí zašlu závěrečné shrnutí mého výzkumu.

.....

Appendix II: Final Form of the Questionnaire

Přístupy a postoje učitelů k výuce gramatiky angličtiny

Vážená paní, vážený pane,

jsm studentka Filozofické fakulty Univerzity Karlovy v Praze, obor anglistika-amerikanistika. V rámci své diplomové práce provádím dotazníkové šetření týkající se přístupů a postojů učitelů k výuce gramatiky angličtiny a tímto bych Vás ráda požádala o spolupráci na mém výzkumu vyplněním následujícího dotazníku. Cílem tohoto výzkumu je lépe porozumět názorům učitelů na výuku anglické gramatiky a popsat způsoby výuky gramatiky angličtiny na českých středních školách.

Tento dotazník je zcela anonymní a veškeré informace získané v rámci tohoto výzkumu budou použity výhradně pro účely výše zmíněné diplomové práce. V případě Vašeho zájmu o výsledky tohoto šetření můžete na konci dotazníku uvést Vaši emailovou adresu, na kterou Vám s radostí zašlu závěrečné shrnutí svého výzkumu.

Vyplnění dotazníku Vám zabere asi 15-20 minut.

V případě jakýchkoli dotazů ohledně tohoto výzkumu mě můžete kontaktovat na emailové adrese lusiin.cizkova@gmail.com.

Předem Vám velice děkuji za Váš čas a ochotu.

Označte prosím, do jaké míry souhlasíte s následujícími tvrzeními týkajícími se výuky anglické gramatiky.

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM	JINÉ (vlozte komentář)
1. Studenti se mohou naučit anglickou gramatiku i bez učitele.					
2. Studenti si osvojí gramatiku nejlépe kontaktem s jazykem a během přirozené komunikace v angličtině.					
3. Studenti se mohou naučit gramatické struktury jako ustálené nebo poloustálené výrazy a fráze.					
4. Studentova znalost angličtiny by měla mimo jiné zahrnovat teoretickou znalost gramatického systému a způsobu jeho fungování.					
5. Výuka gramatiky by měla být hlavní součástí výuky jazyka.					
6. Přímá (frontální, explicitní) výuka gramatiky je nezbytná pro studentovu schopnost vyjadřovat se gramaticky správně.					
7. Gramatiku by se měli učit studenti všech úrovní znalosti jazyka (začátečníci, středně pokročilí i pokročilí).					

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM	JINÉ (vložte komentář)
8. Je důležité zaměřit se na gramatiku během každé hodiny angličtiny.					
9. Hlavním úkolem učitele během výuky gramatiky je vysvětlovat nová gramatická pravidla a výjimky.					
10. Výuka gramatiky musí probíhat odděleně od komunikačních aktivit.					
11. Učitel by měl začít výuku gramatiky teoretickým vysvětlením nové gramatické struktury.					
12. V zájmu vysvětlení či procvičení jevu, se kterým mají studenti problém, je možné porušit plán hodiny.					
13. Hlavní součástí výuky gramatiky by mělo být procvičování gramatických jevů.					
14. Procvičování gramatiky pomocí samostatných vět je ve výuce gramatiky užitečné.					
15. Užití gramatických jevů ve volném projevu je nezbytnou součástí procesu učení se gramatiky.					
16. Časté/pravidelné procvičování gramatických jevů významně přispívá ke studentově schopnosti správně a přesně používat gramatiku.					
17. Procvičování gramatických jevů musí vždy probíhat v určitém kontextu daném komunikační situací.					
18. Procvičování mechanickým drilem je užitečné pro výuku a učení se jazyka.					
19. Přímé (explicitní, frontální) vysvětlení gramatiky pomáhá studentům úspěšně opravit vlastní gramatické chyby.					
20. Učitel by měl opravovat všechny gramatické chyby, kterých se studenti dopustí během ústního projevu.					

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM	JINÉ (vložte komentář)
21. Učitel by měl označit všechny gramatické chyby, kterých se studenti dopustí v psaném projevu.					
22. Pro studenty je velmi obtížné vyvarovat se gramatických chyb, protože anglická gramatika je příliš komplexní/složitá.					
23. Není potřeba, aby se studenti vyjadřovali v gramaticky zcela bezchybných větách, pokud dokáží vyjádřit, co chtějí.					
24. Učitel by měl opravovat pouze gramatické chyby, které mění smysl studentovy výpovědi.					
25. Učitel by se měl snažit předcházet možným studentovým chybám již během výkladu gramatiky.					
26. Moji studenti se nenaučí všechny gramatické jevy a pravidla probíraná v hodinách angličtiny, protože jim nejsou schopni porozumět a zapamatovat si je.					
27. Moji studenti očekávají, že jim novou gramatiku vyložím přímo (explicitně).					
28. Při procvičování gramatického jevu zvládají moji studenti doplňovací gramatická cvičení, ale mají potíže s jeho užitím ve volném projevu.					
29. Při učení se gramatiky upřednostňují moji studenti příklady samostatných vět.					
30. Moji studenti používají v hodinách gramatickou terminologii (např. termín „past participle“).					
31. Již procvičené gramatické jevy obsažené v autentických materiálech (např. článcích z novin) dělají mým studentům problémy.					

	NAPROSTO NESOUHLASÍM	NESOUHLASÍM	SOUHLASÍM	NAPROSTO SOUHLASÍM	JINÉ (vlozte komentář)
32. Teoretická znalost gramatického systému dodává mým studentům pocit jistoty.					
33. Moji studenti se učí gramatické jevy jako fráze a ustálené výrazy, ze kterých si později odvozují pravidla pro jejich tvoření a užití.					

34. Jak učíte Vy sám/sama gramatiku ve svých hodinách angličtiny?

A. Nejprve studentům představím nový gramatický jev a s ním spojená pravidla a poté jim dám příklady použití dané gramatiky.	
B. Nejprve dám studentům příklady použití gramatického jevu a poté je vybídnu, aby gramatická pravidla odvodili z příkladů sami.	
Využívám postupu (A.) i (B.).	
Nevyužívám ani postupu (A.) ani (B.). --> 35. Popište prosím způsob, jakým učíte gramatiku.	

Označte prosím, JAK ČASTO využíváte dané výukové strategie ve svých hodinách angličtiny.

	NIKDY	ZŘÍDKA	OBČAS	ČASTO
36. Při výuce gramatiky používám češtinu (např. překlad pojmů, vysvětlení pravidel).				
37. Gramatiku vysvětluji psanou formou (např. píšu gramatické jevy, pravidla nebo příklady na tabuli).				
38. Při výuce gramatiky dávám studentům co nejvíce příkladů užití daného jevu.				
39. Studenta vybízím, aby svou gramatickou chybu opravil sám.				
40. Gramatická pravidla názorně odvozují z příkladových vět, které studentům představím.				
41. Při výuce anglické gramatiky ukazuji studentům podobnosti a odlišnosti od českého gramatického systému.				
42. Při ústních cvičeních procvičuji gramatické struktury mechanickým drilem.				
43. Nový gramatický jev porovnávám se studentům již známou gramatikou angličtiny.				
44. Gramatické jevy předkládám studentům v rámci ucelených textů (např. krátkého příběhu).				
45. Během výuky gramatiky používám gramatickou terminologii (např. termín „past continuous tense“).				
46. Při výuce gramatiky používám neupravené autentické materiály (např. články z časopisů).				
47. Při výuce gramatiky využívám studentových schopností tvořit si určité hypotézy o gramatice, které si později potvrdí nebo vyvrátí.				
48. Pokud mají studenti potíže při procvičování gramatiky, pomáhám jim návodnými otázkami.				

	NIKDY	ZŘÍDKA	OBČAS	ČASTO
49. Jako hlavní učební materiál používám při výuce gramatiky učebnici, kterou mají všichni studenti.				
50. Gramatické jevy vysvětluji v pořadí, ve kterém je uvádí lekce učebnice.				
51. Během procvičování gramatiky zadávám studentům úkoly a problémové situace, při jejichž řešení jsou nuceni používat procvičovanou gramatiku.				

Označte prosím MÍRU ÚČINNOSTI dané strategie výuky anglické gramatiky vzhledem k Vaším studentům.

	VELMI ÚČINNÉ	SPÍŠE NEÚČINNÉ	ÚČINNÉ	VELMI ÚČINNÉ
52. Při výuce gramatiky používám češtinu (např. překlad pojmů, vysvětlení pravidel).				
53. Gramatiku vysvětluji psanou formou (např. píšu gramatické jevy, pravidla nebo příklady na tabuli).				
54. Při výuce gramatiky dávám studentům co nejvíce příkladů užití daného jevu.				
55. Studenta vybízím, aby svou gramatickou chybu opravil sám.				
56. Gramatická pravidla názorně odvozuji z příkladových vět, které studentům představím.				
57. Při výuce anglické gramatiky ukazuji studentům podobnosti a odlišnosti od českého gramatického systému.				
58. Při ústních cvičeních procvičuji gramatické struktury mechanickým drilem.				
59. Nový gramatický jev porovnávám se studentům již známou gramatikou angličtiny.				
60. Gramatické jevy předkládám studentům v rámci ucelených textů (např. krátkého příběhu).				
61. Během výuky gramatiky používám gramatickou terminologii (např. termín „past continuous tense“).				
62. Při výuce gramatiky používám neupravené autentické materiály (např. články z časopisů).				
63. Při výuce gramatiky využívám studentových schopností tvořit si určité hypotézy o gramatice, které si později potvrdí nebo vyvrátí.				
64. Pokud mají studenti potíže při procvičování gramatiky, pomáhám jim návodnými otázkami.				
65. Jako hlavní učební materiál používám při výuce gramatiky učebnici, kterou mají všichni studenti.				
66. Gramatické jevy vysvětluji v pořadí, ve kterém je uvádí lekce učebnice.				
67. Během procvičování gramatiky zadávám studentům úkoly a problémové situace, při jejichž řešení jsou nuceni používat procvičovanou gramatiku.				

68. *Otázka na závěr: Ve výuce jazyků se často mluví o METODĚ. Máte nějakou svoji metodu učení gramatiky angličtiny? Pokud ano, krátce ji prosím popište.*

Na úplný závěr prosím poskytněte několik informací o sobě.

69. **Způsob, kterým vyučuji gramatiku angličtiny byl ovlivněn zejména (označte libovolný počet platných možností):**

- A) účastí na didaktických seminářích na SŠ/VOŠ/VŠ
- B) materiální a metodickou podporou ze strany školy, na které vyučuji
- C) příkladem učitele během vlastního studia cizího jazyka (na ZŠ, SŠ, jazykové škole atp.)
- D) používanými učebnicemi (student's books) v mých hodinách angličtiny
- E) metodickými a didaktickými příručkami
- F) využíváním metodické knihy pro učitele (teacher's book)
- G) vlastní zkušeností s vyučováním studentů
- H) jiné:

70. **Stupeň školy nebo škol, na kterých učíte anglický jazyk:**

- A) střední odborná škola
- B) gymnázium
- C) jiné:

71. **Délka Vaší praxe výuky anglického jazyka:**

- A) méně než 1 rok
- B) 1-5 let
- C) 5-10 let
- D) více než 10 let

72. **Vaše nejvyšší dosažené vzdělání je:**

- A) NEpedagogického zaměření
- B) pedagogického zaměření

73. **Vaše nejvyšší dosažené vzdělání je:**

- A) SŠ s maturitou
- B) VOŠ
- C) bakalářské
- D) magisterské
- E) doktorské
- F) JINÉ (uveďte prosím druh Vaší kvalifikace):

74. **Škola a fakulta, na které jste své nejvyšší dosažené vzdělání získal/a (např. Pedagogická fakulta Jihočeské Univerzity v Českých Budějovicích):**

.....

75. **Rok, kdy jste své nejvyšší dosažené vzdělání získal/a:**

.....

76. **Vaše kvalifikace/aprobace (např. Učitelství pro 2. stupeň ZŠ M-AJ):**

.....

77. **Váš věk:**

78. **Máte-li zájem, uveďte Vaši emailovou adresu, na kterou Vám s radostí zašlu závěrečné shrnutí svého výzkumu.**

.....